SIGILLVM · R · D · IOHANNIS · ARCHIEPISCOPI · SANCTI · ANDREE
I
S

64-2
38

LIBRARY
OF THE
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
AT
PRINCETON, N. J.
DONATION OF
SAMUEL AGNEW,
OF PHILADELPHIA, PA.
Letter
No.
March 25th 1858.

BX 8915 .S23 1844 v.1
Sage, John, 1652-1711.
The works of the Right Rev.
John Sage, a bishop of the

THE

WORKS

OF THE

RIGHT REV. JOHN SAGE,

A BISHOP OF THE CHURCH IN SCOTLAND;

WITH

MEMOIR AND NOTES.

VOLUME I.

EDINBURGH:

PRINTED FOR THE SPOTTISWOODE SOCIETY.

M.DCCC.XLIV.

ALEX. LAURIE AND CO. PRINTERS TO HER MAJESTY.

THE

FUNDAMENTAL CHARTER

OF

PRESBYTERY,

AS IT HATH BEEN LATELY ESTABLISHED

IN THE

KINGDOM OF SCOTLAND,

EXAMIN'D AND DISPROV'D

BY THE HISTORY, RECORDS, AND PUBLIC TRANSACTIONS OF OUR NATION.

TOGETHER WITH A

PREFACE,

WHEREIN THE VINDICATOR OF THE KIRK IS FREELY PUT IN MIND OF HIS HABITUAL INFIRMITIES.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR C. BROME, AT THE GUN, AT THE WEST END OF ST PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD.

1695.

MEMOIR OF THE LIFE AND TIMES

OF

BISHOP SAGE.

THE custom of writing the lives of eminent authors is a very old and excellent one. By this means, besides preserving their memories from oblivion, and paying to them a tribute which is justly due, students and readers in general are peculiarly gratified by being, as it were, introduced to a more intimate acquaintance with those from whose labours they have derived both profit and pleasure. And the place usually assigned to such lives—viz. at the beginning of those works which were intended by their learned authors to promote the cause of truth and virtue — is a very apposite one; because, as persons are more ready to receive either joyful or bad news, when they are satisfied concerning the integrity of him who communicates it, so they are better prepared for a candid investigation and reception of truth, when they are assured of the excellence of his character by whom it is propounded. In accordance with this time-honoured usage, it were greatly to be desired that a faithful and perfect picture of the eminent author of the following Treatises could be drawn and prefixed to this Collection of his Works, in order that Churchmen might be thoroughly acquainted with the character and conduct of one who so "earnestly contended" and suffered for the faith in a day of trial, and whose writings have conferred such a boon, not only on the men of his own generation, but on us, and all in every age who value

"Evangelical Truth" with "Apostolic Order." But, alas! this cannot be. It has been remarked with regret by a previous biographer of Bishop Sage, that "he could not get such information as was necessary to enable him to publish a full account of his life;" and that he was limited to the scanty materials with which his own memory supplied him, and which he could gather from other personal friends of the Bishop. If one, then, who himself enjoyed the privilege of our author's friendship, and wrote only *three* years after his death, was so straitened for information concerning him, the reader must not be disappointed that the present Editor, after most diligent search in every quarter where information was likely to be obtained, has not been able to collect many facts which throw additional light upon the earlier years of the future Prelate, or introduce us to a better acquaintance, than that which we now possess, with his habits and pursuits at a more mature age. But out of such materials as are within his reach, the Editor proceeds to supply the Reader with a new biographical memoir of the illustrious Divine whose writings are now presented again to the world.

JOHN SAGE was born at Creich, a small parish in Fifeshire, in 1652 — at which period Scotland was in the hands of Cromwell and his victorious troops. He was descended from an old and respectable family, who for more than seven generations had resided in the same parish. His father had served as a Captain in the regiment of Lord Duffus, the Governor of Dundee, and was quartered in that town, when it was besieged and taken by General Monk and the Republican army in 1651. But what were the family connections of his mother, and whether his parents had any other children, it is now impossible to ascertain. At the time of his birth, the worldly circumstances of the family were extremely reduced. Like many others, the Sages had suffered severely by their unflinching adherence to the Royal cause; and after the Restoration, they found the Government ungrateful, and unwilling to make any compensation for the arduous services which they had

rendered, and the heavy losses which they had sustained. But if the fortune of Captain Sage had been impaired, he possessed the inward consciousness of having endeavoured to "fear God and honour the King"—a reward infinitely outweighing all the gain of gold gotten by the dereliction of duty; and though his diminished acres and narrow purse left him little wealth to bequeath to his son, the bright example of loyalty and integrity, which he manifested under most trying circumstances, was a far more precious legacy; and the sequel of young Sage's history shows us that it was not lost upon him in after years. Notwithstanding the narrowness of his means, the Captain was careful about the education of his son. Very justly regarding it as an object of paramount importance, he, most probably at much inconvenience to himself, provided that he should enjoy every opportunity of acquiring learning and information, which the country supplied. At that time, in those excellent institutions—the parochial schools of Scotland—boys were instructed in the rudiments of Latin and Greek, as well as in other departments of useful knowledge. To these, then, the subject of our memoir was sent, and the early indications of talent and industry which he evinced under the tuition of the parish schoolmaster, encouraged his father to strain every nerve in order to give his son the benefits of a University course. Accordingly, he was taken to St Andrews, and regularly matriculated in St Salvador's College, as a student of that *then* far-famed seat of learning. After having finished his academical course, and performed all the exercises required by the statutes, in July 1669 he was advanced to the degree of Master of Arts, beyond which it does not appear that he afterwards proceeded.[1] It rarely happens

[1] In various Biographies of Bishop Sage it is stated that he graduated in 1672. But the following excerpt from the Books of the University, made at the request of the Editor, by his friend Mr Lyon, the learned Historian of St Andrews, shews the usual date assigned for the Bishop's graduation to be incorrect. The excerpt is also interesting, as containing the names of other persons eminent in the annals of Scottish Episcopacy, who took their degrees at the same time, were fellow-sufferers with the venerable Bishop for conscience sake, and fought side by side with him

that eminent talent and assiduous application are united in the same individual; but in young Sage there was this happy blending of these qualities. During his College life he was not more distinguished for his surprising genius, than for the diligent culture which he bestowed upon it. He studied with avidity the Greek and Latin authors, and laid the foundation of that profound learning, which gave him such an amazing advantage over his adversaries in controversy. and entitled him to rank among the best scholars of

in defence of the "faith once delivered to the saints." The date, *June* 2, indicates the application for the degree, and *July* 24, the day on which it was conferred. The fac simile of Bishop Sage's signature, which is very accurate, was traced by Mr Lyon.

"*July* 24. *Anno* 1669.

"Nomina candidatorum utriusque Collegii quorum nomina subsequuntur, qui, postquam, secundum leges Academiæ, domino domino pro cancellario jusjurandum dedissent, lauream magisterialem consequuti sunt.

Candidati in Collegio Leonardino. Junii 2, 1669.	Candidati in Collegiō Salvatoriano.
Allanus Lamont.	Johannes Rymerus.
Gulielmus Popplewell.	Jacobus Barclay.
Johannes Makgill, major.	Patricius Wallace.
Johannes Makgill, minor.	Jacobus Ochterlony.
Arthurus Makgill.	Jacobus Mercer.
Alexr. Lundie.	Johannes Malcolme.
Alexr. Græm.	Georgius Blaro.
David Thomsone.	Dav. Ogilvy.
David Henderson.	Geo. Ogilvy.
Alexr. Lindsay.	Dav. Cant.
Jacobus Smart.	Donaldus Macara.
Gulielmus Nairne.	Patricius Strachane.
Robertus Lindsay.	Alexr. Monro.
	Georgius Douglas.
	Gulielmus Methven.
	David Ogilvie.
	Robertus Ritchey.
	Gulielmus Brocas.
	Johannes Reid.
	Johannes Shaw.
	Gulielmus Spence.

Johannes Sage

his age. Nor did he confine himself to the field of classical literature. His was one of those comprehensive minds, seldom to be met with, which are capable of grasping a variety of subjects. Besides studying the authors of Greece and Rome, he devoted himself to Logic and Metaphysics, and was versed in the various parts of philosophical learning which at that time generally prevailed in the schools. Perhaps to us in these days, who affect to despise the philosophy of the ancients, it may seem as if the time spent in obtaining a knowledge of their abstruse theories might have been expended more profitably on other things. But "he always spoke of them as highly useful to him who would understand the poets, historians, and orators of ancient Greece, and even the Fathers of the Christian Church, many of whom have adopted the principles of some one or other of the systems of ancient philosophy, reasoned from their notions, and often made use of their terms and phrases." In this opinion every one who is even cursorily acquainted with the writings of the Fathers, more especially Origen, Clement Alexandrinus, and Tertullian, will agree with him.

After leaving the University, the circumstances of young Sage would not permit him to enjoy the "*otium cum dignitate*," which is so favourable to study. He was obliged to look around him for employment, in order to obtain his daily bread. Nothing better presented itself at the time than the office of parish schoolmaster of Ballingray in Fife, which was easily obtained by one whose attainments were well known throughout the surrounding district. He did not, however, retain this situation long, for we find him soon after exchanging it for a similar one at Tippermuir in Perthshire, probably because the slender salary, which he received as the reward of his laborious duties, was somewhat increased by the change. To a person of our author's cultivated mind it is easy to conceive that the teaching of a parish school must have been intolerable drudgery, yet he appears to have discharged its duties with scrupulous care. But the constant confinement and anxious excitement which it entailed on him, together with his being deprived of the comforts of life,

were the means of his contracting the seeds of several diseases, which, notwithstanding the native vigour of his constitution, preyed upon and impaired his health, and tended finally to shorten his days. Unfavourable to mental cultivation as was the state of restless anxiety arising from Mr Sage's "chill penury," which, according to the old maxim—*in paupertate et angustis non datur locus studiis*—is said to

> "Freeze the genial current of the soul,"

his thoughts were in vigorous exercise, and while his thirst for knowledge increased, he was pursuing his studies with renewed ardour and diligence. But if in the obscure school-room of Tippermuir, surrounded with the children of the village, and worn out from fatigue, he ever allowed himself to indulge the aspirations of a laudable ambition, and to cherish the hope of rising to a station more congenial to his tastes, and better adapted to his great talents, he might with exquisite propriety, deterred by the difficulty and remoteness of the prospect, have exclaimed—

> "Ah! who can tell how hard it is to climb
> The steep where Fame's proud temple shines afar?"

Yet, discouraging as was the situation in which he was placed, it led, by the providence of God, to his future advancement. In the neighbourhood of Tippermuir Mr Drummond of Cultmalundie resided, and having observed the talents and diligence of the parish schoolmaster, he wisely selected him as tutor to his sons. This promotion was both seasonable and profitable to Sage. It relieved him from the confinement and labour of a school, and brought him into a position where, besides having his comforts increased, he was introduced into better society, and had an opportunity of recommending himself by his attainments and prepossessing manners. After spending some years in the private tuition of the young Drummonds, their father determined to send his sons to the public school of Perth, and Mr Sage was entrusted with the care of them while they remained at that seminary. Here he continued faithfully to discharge his duty to his pupils, and to improve

himself in the various branches of useful learning. While at Perth he became acquainted with Dr Alexander Rose, afterwards Lord Bishop of Edinburgh, then minister of the "Fair City." That pious and eminent individual easily discerned the excellent qualities and great learning of the humble tutor, and admitted him to his friendship, which eventually proved of the utmost advantage to Sage, and "was highly valued by him all the days of his life." The progress which the young Drummonds made under his instructions, and their advancing years, rendered it necessary for their father to deliberate whether or not he was to proceed further with their education. In Scotland, where the facilities were much greater than in England, there were few families who did not give their sons the benefit of a collegiate course. Accordingly Mr Drummond resolved to send his sons to the University of St Andrews, and determined that Sage should accompany them thither, to assist them in their academical studies by his knowledge, and to guide them during a critical period of youth by his example and advice. This arrangement was not more beneficial to the pupils, than it was agreeable and useful to their tutor. It brought him into contact with men of the same habits and pursuits with himself; and his noble genius and vast acquirements, which had hitherto been known within a very limited circle, began now to shine forth more brightly in the enlarged sphere in which he found himself placed, and to attract towards their possessor the observation of the learned. "His piercing wit," says Bishop Gillan, "solid judgment, and pleasant temper, endeared him to all the members of the University. They were not a little surprized to find a man, bred in obscurity and retirement, of so great sense and learning, of so nice and delicate a conversation, and who understood men and manners so exactly well. His company was courted by all the Professors and Masters, and himself honoured and esteemed by all that knew how to value true merit." It was the observation of the wise King of Israel, that "as iron sharpeneth iron, so a man sharpeneth the countenance of his friend;" and this proverb was singularly verified in the

person of our author at this time, to whom alacrity and spirits were imparted by his intercourse with men of learning and science, and whose good parts and abilities were improved by the opportunities of conversation which he enjoyed. But this was not the only advantage which his residence at St Andrews procured for him. In the valuable Library of the University he had the means of becoming acquainted with books, with which his own limited resources could never have supplied him, and thus of adding to that already considerable stock of profound learning, which was afterwards so skilfully employed in support of true religion, and causes him to rank amongst the foremost of Scoto-Catholic divines. Nor was our author himself insensible to the advantages of his present position. While his excellent sense prompted him to seize the opportunity, and improve it with diligence, his sincere piety led him, adds his venerable biographer, to "adore the Divine Providence which had blessed him with the comfort and advantage of so desirable and learned a society, and the opportunity of perusing the best and choicest books."

The Collegiate course of his pupils being finished, Sage was again thrown upon his own resources; and both his pecuniary circumstances, and his natural inclination to an active and useful life, prompted him to seek for immediate employment. In this, however, he was not successful. Like many talented and deserving persons at the outset of life, he had to endure the burden of disappointment, doubt, and anxiety. Probably there is no situation, in which a young man of learning and high spirit can be placed, more trying than when he finds his first struggles with the world ineffectual, and feels himself as it were pushed back by the failure of his attempts to advance. Happily for the subject of our Memoir, he was soon relieved from his distressing position by the timely aid of friendship.

It has already been stated, that, while with the young Drummonds at the public seminary of Perth, his learning and excellent demeanour had attracted the notice and gained him the esteem of the worthy minister of the city, the Rev. Alex-

ander Rose. Of this venerable man it will be necessary to say something, before we proceed farther with the narrative of our author's life. Born of an ancient family in the North of Scotland, he was educated and graduated at King's College, Aberdeen; but went through a theological course at Glasgow under the tuition of Dr Gilbert Burnet, afterwards minister of Saltoun in Haddingtonshire, and the well-known Bishop of Salisbury. Having been admitted into Holy Orders, his first preferment was the parish of Perth, which he left for the appointment of Professor of Divinity in the University of Glasgow. In 1684, through the influence of his uncle, the Primate of all Scotland, he was nominated by the Crown to the Principality of St Mary's College in the University of St Andrews. But his piety and talents recommended him for elevation to a higher sphere of usefulness. Accordingly, in 1687, the Royal mandate was issued for his consecration to the See of Moray, in the room of Bishop Colin Falconar deceased; but the Diocese of Edinburgh becoming vacant in the same year by the translation of Bishop Patterson to Glasgow, Dr Rose was selected as his successor, and was translated to Edinburgh "before," says Keith, "he had taken possession of the See of Moray." Of this illustrious Prelate in his high position in the Episcopate, much has been already written by various authors; and his journey to London at the Revolution of 1688, his affecting interview with the Prince of Orange, by which the destiny of the Episcopal Church as an Establishment was sealed, and his noble answer when asked to follow the example of those English Bishops who joined the standard of William, are so well known that they need not be repeated here. Deprived of his Cathedral, spoiled of his revenues, and stripped of his civil dignities, this excellent man continued after the Revolution, and overthrow of the Church in Scotland, to exercise the authority of a successor of the Apostles, of which no efforts of man could deprive him; and under his auspices the sacred ark was directed during those trying and stormy times, when the face of the civil power was turned against the Church,

and the "arm of flesh" was lifted up in the vain endeavour to root out Catholicity from Scotland. He is described by a contemporary as "a sweet-tempered man, and of a venerable aspect;" and these things, his excellent disposition and benign appearance, combined with his discretion, seem completely to have disarmed the Presbyterians, even in those days of keen party spirit, and incautious malevolence between persons attached to opposite and hostile interests, for we do not find that the enemies of the Church ever ventured to assail with false and malicious aspersions the character of this genuine servant of God. Having outlived all the brethren of his Order, and likewise all the Bishops of England who had possessed Sees before the Revolution, he remained as the remnant of a band hallowed by their sufferings for conscience sake; and his grey hairs went down to the grave with the respect of the clergy of his own Communion, and of the laity of both nations, who, whatever were their opinions upon the question, admired the firm integrity of principle which actuated the Scottish Prelates in their refusal to recognize the Government of William and Mary, and the dignified patience with which they submitted to the loss of all those things which absorb and engage men's attention and time. He died in March 1720, and his mortal remains were interred in the church of Restalrig near Edinburgh, the cemetery of which, from its retired situation and other causes, was much used by the persecuted Episcopalians as a resting-place for their departed friends. The reader will excuse this digression in favour of one whose name has descended as a sort of *heir-loom* in the Church from generation to generation—of one whose position as Bishop of Edinburgh forbids that we should pass him over in silence, or with a mere allusion to his name, as it is connected with the learned individual whose biography we now continue.

In the moment of indecision, when young Sage had for nearly two years been vainly endeavouring to find suitable employment, his thoughts turned towards Dr Rose, and he resolved to visit him and solicit his influence, which, consi-

dering their previous intimacy some few years before, he did not despair of obtaining. Nor was he disappointed, but found the warm hand of friendship extended to welcome him, and a heart which, while it sympathized with him in his helplessness, readily engaged in forming plans for his advancement in life. Not only the situation of Dr Rose as Professor of Divinity in the University of Glasgow, but his connection with the then Archbishop of that See, Dr Arthur Ross, his uncle, rendered him able to be of service to his friend at this critical period. Being well satisfied of his acquirements and excellence, he recommended him to the Archbishop of Glasgow as one admirably fitted for the sacred office of the ministry, and accordingly he was put in Orders by him in the year 1686, and continued to officiate as a Presbyter in the city of Glasgow until after the Revolution. At the time when he entered the ministry of the Church, Sage was about thirty-four years of age—a period of life greatly beyond that which is usually required (the canonical age for the Presbyterate being twenty-four), but certainly not too far advanced for admission to an office, which, at all times and in all places, but more particularly in Scotland at *that crisis*, demanded that those, upon whom it was conferred, should be persons of mature judgment and considerable experience—persons in whom, according to their blessed Lord's command, the "wisdom of the serpent" ought to be combined with the "harmlessness of the dove." Such qualifications were signally blended in Sage, who, says one intimately acquainted with him, "did not run too soon, or too inconsiderately, as too many do, into an office which requires so many and great qualifications. His judgment was mature, and improved by more than ordinary experience. He had read the Holy Scriptures with the best commentators and critics. He was no stranger to ecclesiastical history and the writings of the ancient Fathers, and particularly understood their Apologies for the Christian religion. No man was better acquainted with the school-divinity; and yet this did not hinder but that he reasoned not only closely and accurately, but also plainly

and perspicuously. He had nicely examined the modern controversies, especially those betwixt us and the Church of Rome, and those betwixt the Calvinists and Remonstrants." The entrance into their body of a man so qualified was hailed with delight by the clergy of Glasgow, and the junior Presbyter was in token of their respect soon raised by them into an office in the Diocese which was of great importance, viz. that of Diocesan or Synod Clerk.

For the benefit of our English readers, it will be interesting to give some explanation of this office, and of the discipline of the Church by which it is still recognised. In 1661, when the Apostolical Succession, which has never since been interrupted, was introduced from England with the sanction of the reigning monarch, four Scottish beneficed clergymen, two of whom had been episcopally ordained before 1638, and the other two, having renounced their previous Presbyterian ordination, and being made Deacons and Priests at the time, were consecrated on the 15th December in Westminster Abbey. These persons, thus invested with the Episcopal character, returned to their own country, and committed the holy deposit to other "faithful men" also, who had been previously appointed by the Crown to fill the vacant Sees. But in rebuilding the Church in Scotland "according to the Word of God, and the model of the ancient and Primitive Christians," (as they were desired to do by those, who, being disgusted with Covenanting Presbyterianism, earnestly petitioned for the restoration of Catholic order) the Government of Charles II. acted with *questionable* moderation. It was but right that they should have endeavoured to soften, as much as possible, the prejudices of the Covenanters by every innocent and lawful concession; but when they proceeded to deprive the rulers of the Church of their inherent powers, and to assimilate the heaven-devised system as closely as possible to the democratical and disorderly platform which had been overthrown by its own tyranny and turbulence, they transgressed the bounds of their authority, and made it appear as if the Church were a mere engine of State, which could be modelled according to

the various phases of civil politics, and adapted to the capricious whims and wavering opinions of men. The attempt on their parts to establish the Apostolical order in Scotland was praiseworthy; but the concessions which they made were not only unlawful and injudicious, but, as the event proved, utterly inexpedient. While they failed to conciliate the Covenanters, they stamped a character upon *Established* Scottish Episcopacy which makes its overthrow less to be regretted, and causes the Churchman in these days to magnify and adore the grace of God, which enabled most of the clergy and laity of that period to rise *above* their principles, and to "witness a confession" to the world, which was scarcely to have been expected from the discipline under which they had been trained, and the circumstances of temptation in which they were placed. The external appearance and policy of the Church during this period has been thus described by a modern historian, and it sufficiently corroborates the view here taken of the Episcopacy of that day. "The *Kirk-Sessions* were kept up, in which the parish minister presided; *Presbyteries* met under the direction of some experienced minister appointed by the Bishop; Diocesan Synods were regularly convened, in which the Bishop himself, or the Dean, acted as Moderator; and even General Assemblies might have been held, had the King seen fit to summon them. Besides this, kneeling was *not required at the administration of the Eucharist*; the Established Clergy (with one or two exceptions) used no Liturgy, nor wore any distinguishing dress in their public services; so that a stranger going accidentally into a place of worship at that time, *could not have told whether it were Presbyterian or Episcopal*, &c. All incumbents were allowed to retain possession of their livings, by whatever means obtained, on condition only of submitting to receive their presentation from the patron, and collation from the Bishop."[1] No circumstances could warrant such a departure from Catholic order as is here presented to us; and the conclusion which

[1] See Lyon's History of St Andrews, vol. ii. p. 72, 73.

is forced upon the candid inquirer into this portion of our ecclesiastical history is, that except the *Apostolical Succession*, there was little in the *external* appearance of the Church of that period which resembled the "model of the Primitive Christians." One of the novelties introduced at this time was the system of holding Diocesan Synods, which were established by an Act of the Privy Council, dated September 10, 1662. These Synods differed entirely from those convocations of the ancient Church, which consisted of the Bishop and his Presbyters, wherein, as a Father, he deliberated with them upon matters of doctrine and discipline, and sought the advice of his "*Council*," before taking any important step, or pronouncing any weighty decision. It was not even pretended that they were founded on that venerable usage. They were rather substitutes for the "*Presbyteries*" which had just been overturned; and the members of these Synods, which were composed of the clergy of the Diocese, *in their collective capacity* transacted the business of the Church within their limits. It is true that these synodical meetings were held with the consent of the Bishop, and that either he himself, or one delegated by him, presided at them. But then the only superiority which he enjoyed over any other member, was the privilege of giving the casting vote in disputed cases. It is not quite clear that they had what is called *negative power*, which the Scottish Bishops at present possess over the deliberations of their clergy.[1] As all meetings require a chairman to pre-

[1] The present Scottish Church retains these Diocesan Synods, which are now better regulated. They are held *at least* once a year in each Diocese, and are composed of the Bishop, and, in his absence, the Dean and other clergy. It is not more primitive than reasonable that Bishops should consult their Presbyters in the affairs of the Church. Hence the Church in Scotland has carefully provided for this by retaining the synodical meetings, remodelled after the example of the early Church, and our governors, in all matters of importance, take care that every thing is maturely weighed in the Diocesan councils. The Bishops have full negative power in these conventions, but in judicial matters there is an appeal from the decision of a particular Bishop to the Episcopal College. See Canons XXXI.–XXXV. of the Scottish Episcopal Church, p. 31, 35.

serve order, it was thought good by the ruling powers in the State to confer the right of perpetual Moderatorship upon the Bishops, who were thus robbed of much of their inherent and Divine authority, and the Church was deprived of that paternal and monarchical feature of her government, which is so familiar to persons even cursorily acquainted with early ecclesiastical history. The record of the motions carried, and general business transacted at these conventions, was carefully preserved in a Register kept by an official, styled the "Synod Clerk," who was in general one of the most respected members of the Diocese.

This was the office to which Mr Sage was appointed almost immediately upon his admission into orders; and it appears, from the fact of his having been in possession of the Synod Books at the Revolution, that he retained it up to that eventful crisis. It is quite clear, from what the contemporary biographer of Sage relates concerning his "faithful discharge of all the parts of the *ministerial function*," and his "discourses from the pulpit," that he must have been engaged in more active and strictly clerical duties, than those which the Synod Clerkship entailed on him. But at this distance of time it has been found quite impossible to ascertain the particular sphere in the city of Glasgow which enjoyed the labours and example of this zealous, learned, and excellent man. A tradition has been prevalent in the Church that he was minister of the Barony Parish; but it is contradicted by undoubted documentary evidence. For in the "First Collection of Papers," annexed to the famous pamphlet, "The Case of the Present Afflicted Clergy in Scotland," there is a paper, containing "A Brief Representation of the Sufferings of the Regular Clergy within the Presbytery of Glasgow," which bears the signatures of "Al. George, minister of the *Barony* Church of Glasgow, John Sage, *one of the ministers of* the city of Glasgow"—which shows that Mr Sage's cure was not *that* alluded to above. Whatever it was, we are informed that he discharged the important duties involved in it with faithful diligence, and that his judicious conduct and exemplary life, while they gained him the esteem of

the members of the Church, procured for him also the good-will and respect of those without her pale. There was a remarkable instance of this in the treatment which he received at the hands of the *Hillmen*, who persecuted and insulted the clergy just before the Revolution broke out.

These disorderly fanatics, who were generally of the lower orders, were unswerving adherents to the Solemn League and Covenant, violently opposed to the "*usurping*" Government of the Stuarts, and animated by a deadly hatred to every thing in any way connected with Bishops and *their* authority. Such being the main features in the character of these zealots, they only wanted a good opportunity for showing their antipathy to the Church, and inflicting injury and insult upon her ministers. In the palmy days of the Covenant, after the famous 1638—those days when Henderson, and Loudon, and Johnston of Warriston, were in the zenith of their popularity and power—they enjoyed *such* an opportunity, and they did not fail to improve it.[1] The day of their triumph happily soon came to an end—Scotland was subdued by Cromwell, and even Scottish Presbyterianism had to bow down beneath the galling yoke of English Dissent. "Greek had met Greek" in this case, and the result was, that Cromwell ruled Scotland with a rod of iron, and the Covenanters, in lamenting their own misfortunes, were drawn off from persecuting the unfortunate Prelatists.[2] At the Restoration, the Government of Charles II.,

[1] See Lawson's Episcopal Church from the Reformation to the Revolution, chap. xvii. p. 635.

[2] A venerated historian says of Monk, Cromwell's generalissimo in the North, that—"He gave orders to the civil judges not to meddle with the goods and estates of such as the Assembly should excommunicate, &c. This check upon the arbitrary discipline of the Kirk was highly displeasing to some, but as *satisfactory and welcome to others*." As an instance of this joy at the subjugation of the Covenanters, we are told that Mr Irvine, the Laird of Drum (one of the oldest and best families in Aberdeenshire, and down to the present day firm in its attachment to "Prelacy"), wrote a polite letter of thanks to Monk for restoring conscience to its just freedom, and rescuing people from the intolerant tyranny of the Presbyteries. This gentleman, who had suffered greatly for his loyalty and

for its own security, kept a watchful eye upon the movements of the Covenanters, and restrained their irregularities by the strong arm of the law. At the commencement of the reign of the ill-fated James, the lawlessness of these disaffected persons was effectually kept in check; but upon the news of the landing of the Prince of Orange in England, the King was obliged to order all his standing forces in Scotland to repair to the royal standard in the South. This, while it weakened the Scottish Government, left the country in a defenceless state, and furnished a splendid occasion to the discontented and fanatical for creating disturbances, and punishing those whom they chose to consider *Malignants*. The Hill-men, or Cameronians, seized the precious moment, and began a shocking system of persecution and cruelty against the incumbents of the different parishes, by which about two hundred ministers and their families were driven from their houses in the winter season, and cast upon the precarious benevolence of their neighbours. Their method of procedure has been thus narrated by a contemporary, and a sufferer from their violence:—"They assembled themselves in the night time, and sometimes in the day, in small bodies, armed; and in a hostile way went through the countries, forcing their entry into private men's houses, against whom they had any private quarrel, but most ordinarily into ministers' houses, where they with tongue and hands committed all outrages imaginable against the ministers, their wives and children; where, having ate and drank plentifully, at parting they used to carry the minister out of his house to the church-yard, or some public place of the town or village, and there expose him to the people as a condemned malefactor—gave him strict charge never to preach any more in that place, but to remove himself and

opposition to the Covenant, being cited on a suspicion of *Popery* by the Presbytery of Aberdeen, summoned them in return before Colonel Overton, one of the English Judges, and appealed from their merciless tribunal to the Parliament of England. This shews that, in the day of their prosperity, they had created for themselves a *terrible* name, which made any authority preferable to theirs. See Skinner's Ecclesiastical History, vol. ii. p. 429.

his family out of it immediately; and for the conclusion of all this tragedy, they caused his gown to be torn over his head in a hundred pieces—of some they spared not their very clothes to their shirts. When they had done with the minister, they called for the keys of the church, locked the doors, and carried the keys with them; and last of all, they threw the minister's furniture out of his house in many places, as the last act of this barbarous scene. This was the most general method when the minister was found at home, but in case he was absent, they entered his house, made intimation of their will and pleasure to his wife and servants, bidding them tell him to remove from that place. If they found not a ready obedience, they would return and make him an example to others."

Such was the real character of the system of "rabbling," which the clergy had to endure about the period of the Revolution. It seems, however, that the disorderly mob treated Mr Sage with more mercy than they displayed generally to the rest of his brethren in the Diocese of Glasgow;[1] for, as his venerable biographer quaintly informs us—"the *saints* contented themselves with giving him a *warning* to depart from Glasgow, and threatenings if he should ever adventure to return thither again." This forbearance on their part was singular enough, when it is considered that Mr Sage was a strenuous opponent and an avowed disapprover of their principles and conduct. As a minister of the everlasting Gospel, which contains rules of faith and practice, he felt himself imperatively called upon, both by argument and pathetic exhortation, to enforce the duty of loyalty and obedience to the "powers that be," which he saw was much depreciated by his countrymen. Being firmly persuaded in his own mind of the truth of the "Apostolical Succession," and convinced of the invalidity of Orders which do not emanate from duly consecrated Bishops, he was careful in his sermons to set forth the necessity of communicating with the Episcopal Church. Having marked in the sacred

[1] See "Case of Afflicted Clergy," First Collection of Papers.

Scriptures that striking feature of external unity by which the Church of the blessed Redeemer is traced by the pens of the inspired writers, and the warnings which are thickly strewn upon the pages of the New Testament against "divisions," and instability in matters of religion, he was wont loudly to censure the prevalent disposition for "change," and to insist that separation from the Church of Scotland—receiving the Sacraments from other hands than those of her Bishops, and inferior clergy—and frequenting places of worship, offered to God by unauthorised men, were acts, which constituted the sin of schism, and involved those who practised them in the serious consequences which the Word of God denounces against it. In these his discourses, he had respect to two opposite parties by which the Church was at that time attacked—1*st*, To the disciples of the Covenant, who, besides setting at nought the command to "give unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's," i. e. to obey the existing laws, and reverence the persons of those in whom authority was invested, carried their notions of "*Gospel liberty*" so far as to reject every sort of restraint upon their *religious* opinions, and to regard *themselves* as the only true interpreters of the meaning of the Bible, and the *late* discoverers of the scriptural model of the Church of Christ. What the pious and amiable Leighton used to say of them was strictly characteristic—"*That they made themselves the standards of opinions and practices, and never looked either abroad into the world, to see what others were doing, nor yet back into the former times, to observe what might be warranted or recommended by antiquity.*"[1]—2*d*, To the members of the Romish schism, who, though loyal so far as civil politics were concerned, were the open enemies of the Church in Scotland. Believing that the Bishop of Rome is, *jure divino*, the Supreme Prelate of the Christian Church, and that all spiritual authority must flow through him, they regarded the Scotican Church, which rejected the Pope's

[1] See Historical Relation of the late General Assembly continued, p. 11.

authority in Scotland, as schismatical, and zealously strove to effect her overthrow both by secret stratagem and open opposition.

To both these classes of men, the discourses of Mr Sage were directed, and he wielded against them "the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God"—the Word of God, not as interpreted by Scottish Covenanting Presbyterians, nor by those who own the sway of an Italian Bishop, but by the CATHOLIC CHURCH, making herself heard in General Councils, the decrees of which were afterwards universally received by Christians *both in the East and West* —both in the *Latin and Greek Churches.* It is easy to imagine that discourses of such a nature were by no means palatable, and that a clergyman, who in the "west" of Scotland was so bold as to preach them, stood a very fair chance of raising up a host of enemies against himself. There is, however, an innate charm in consistency and earnestness, which cannot fail to make an impression on all who are not totally blinded by prejudice, and cause them, even though they do not coincide with a man's opinions, to have a respect for his character. This was the case with Mr Sage, at this memorable crisis of our national ecclesiastical history. An uncompromising Catholic himself, he endeavoured to persuade his schismatical countrymen to come within the pale of the Church, because he firmly believed her to be the only lawful dispenser of the Word and Sacraments. But his exhortations breathed the spirit of Christian charity, and evinced his affectionate earnestness for the souls of the people. Thus the malice of the enemies of the Church was disarmed, and they were compelled to esteem the bold asserter of the Apostolical claims. "To this," says Gillan, "it may in some measure be imputed that he escaped those outrageous insults and cruelties which the rabblers (after the example of their schismatical forefathers—the *Circumcelliones* in Africk) acted against others of his brethren, especially those who had trimmed."

There were many ministers, who, having lived before the Restoration, and been great supporters of the Covenant,

nevertheless saw that it was their interest to conform to the changes which were occurring, and became very warm advocates for Episcopacy, and very bitter opponents to their former friends. This continued while the Government was vigorous, but observing the "signs of the times," these persons foresaw the approach of the Revolution, and wisely provided for the coming exigency by modifying their tone, and affecting popularity. Others of them, again, who "had not been thoroughly purged of the old leaven, with which they had been soured before the restoration of the Church and Royal Family," but whose consciences were of that *flexible* nature which permitted them to accommodate themselves to circumstances, easily threw off the mask, when they saw the power of the House of Stuart declining, and appeared before the world in their true colours. These trimmers, however, by their variableness, defeated their own purpose, and were treated by the mob of rabblers with greater severity than was exercised towards their more unflinching and consistent brethren. Many of them were willing to retain their livings by complying with the Revolution Government. But these temporizers did not escape from the merciless violence of the "Hill-men," nor save themselves from being "rabbled" out of their manses.[1]

While the civil and ecclesiastical affairs of Scotland were in this unsettled state, the chair of Divinity in the ancient College of St Mary's,[2] in the University of

[1] See Third Collection of Papers appended to the Case of the Afflicted Clergy.

[2] This College represents, and is supposed to be placed on the very site of, the "Pedagogie," authorised by Bulls of the afterwards deposed Pope Benedict XIII., at the instance of James I., Bishop Wardlaw, and several ecclesiastics, in 1413. Archbishop Alexander Stewart, son of James IV., who, with his father, was afterwards slain on the fatal field of Flodden, converted the "Pedagogium" into a College, and increased the incomes of the Professors, by conferring upon their house the church of St Michael, Tarvet, near Cupar in Fife. Archbishop James Beaton, and his nephew the Cardinal, farther enriched this College, and by virtue of a Bull which they procured from Paul III. in 1537, dedicated it to the "Blessed Virgin Mary of the Assumption." The Archbishop also bequeathed a sum of money for the erection of a noble pile, and the Cardinal had begun

St Andrews, became vacant. The presentation to it belonged to the Crown, but the Primate was in reality the patron, who in this case was Mr Sage's personal friend—Dr Arthur Ross, by whom, when he was Archbishop of Glasgow, he had been admitted into Holy Orders, and who, now that he was elevated to the Primacy, did not forget him. The Primate recommended Sage for the chair, and the copy of his presentation was actually sent up to London by Lord Balcarras.[1] But when his Lord-

to carry out his uncle's plans when he was barbarously assassinated in 1546. Hamilton, the last Archbishop of the Ante-Reformation Succession, who was afterwards executed by order of Lennox, completed the work which had been commenced by his illustrious predecessors, and added greatly by his liberality to the wealth of the College, which was endowed for the express purpose of "defending and confirming the Catholic Faith, that the Christian religion might flourish, the Word of God be more abundantly sown in the hearts of the faithful, and to oppose the heresies and schisms of pestiferous heresiarchs," &c. &c. Alas! the venerable Primate lived to see this College, which he had reared, turn against the ancient Faith; and, like many similar institutions in Scotland, it now answers any purpose except that originally designed by the munificent liberality of the excellent founders. See Lyon's History of St Andrews, vol. i. p. 204, 253, 284, 316; vol. ii. p. 210-212.

[1] Previous biographers of Sage speak of *Lord Balcaskie* as the bearer of this official document; but, although there was an old Scottish family of Balcaskie, the Editor has not been able to discover that, at the period alluded to, the head of that family was prominently engaged in political affairs. He has, therefore, substituted for Balcaskie *Balcarras*, as being the real person intended by the original biographer Gillan, the former word being palpably a typographical error. The person here referred to was Colin third Earl of Balcarras, and one of the most distinguished members of the Noble House of Lindsay. At a very early age he was introduced at the gay Court of Charles II., with whom he became a great favourite. Upon the accession of James II., he continued still in the sunshine of royal favour. Having been made a Privy Councillor in 1680, he was next, 1686, appointed one of the six Secret Council in whom the Government of Scotland was lodged. When the news of William's arrival in London reached Edinburgh, Lord Balcarras was sent express by his colleagues of the Secret Council to receive his Majesty's instructions. It was probably at this time that he carried up Mr Sage's presentation for his Majesty's approval. He had been in town only two or three days, when the unfortunate James re-entered the capital of his kingdom, after having been arrested in his flight at Feversham. In this moment of gloom, when all were deserting the fallen monarch, Lord Balcarras and the gallant Dundee visited him,

ship reached town all things were in confusion, and the monarch a prisoner in his own metropolis. While so many more urgent things demanded the attention of the King, and the few faithful friends who still adhered to him in his dark hour of misfortune, it does not appear that Mr Sage's presentation ever received the royal sanction. In the course of a few days James retired from his dominions, and William and Mary were acknowledged as the sovereigns of England. This important event changed the whole face of affairs in Scotland, and the lateness of Mr Sage's nomination saved him from the mortification of being deprived by the inquisitorial tribunals, which were subsequently appointed to visit and *purge* the Universities.

It has been already stated, that by the withdrawal of troops from Scotland at the out-break of the Revolution, the Cameronians, or Hillmen, were enabled to exercise unheard of cruelties and insults towards the members of the then Scottish Establishment, and that by their illegal proceedings and fanatical violence, about two hundred incumbents were ejected from their parishes. We

and endeavoured to cheer his drooping spirits with the hope of brighter days. James proposed a walk, and the two noblemen were his only attendants. "When he was on the Mall, he stopped and looked at them, and asked how they came to be with him, when all the world had forsaken him, and gone to the Prince of Orange? The Earl said—Their fidelity to so good a master would ever be the same; they had nothing to do with the Prince of Orange. *Lord Dundee made the strongest professions of duty.* 'Will you two, as gentlemen, say you have still attachment to me?'—'Sir, we do.' 'Will you give me your hands upon it as men of honour?' They did so. 'Well, I see you are the men I always took you to be; you shall know all my intentions. I can no longer remain here but as a cypher, or be a pensioner to the Prince of Orange; and you know there is but a small distance between the prisons and graves of kings, therefore I go for France immediately; when there, you shall have my instructions. You, Lord Balcarras, shall have a commission to manage my civil affairs, and you, Lord Dundee, to command my troops in Scotland." After this, the Earl returned to Scotland, and until his death, exerted himself in the interests of the exiled family. He died in 1722, much lamented by his children and friends, who passionately loved him, and was buried with his fathers in the chapel of Balcarras. See Lord Lindsay's "Lives of the Lindsays," Wigan, 1840, vol. ii. p. 1-97.

must now inquire in what light the new Government viewed the conduct of those zealots, and whether they took any steps for restoring the unfortunate clergy to their benefices, of which they had been unjustly deprived. The sufferings of the clergy were so severe, that various accounts were sent up to London concerning them, in order to induce the authorities there to interfere in their behalf. The Bishop of Edinburgh, and many of the Scottish Episcopal Nobility, who were then in London, applied to their friends in high stations about the Court, in the hope of persuading them to use their influence for the "afflicted clergy." But these representations and private appeals were all in vain. At last the clergy resolved to send up a public petition, properly attested, to the Prince, and to depute one of their number to go to Court and present it. Dr Scott, Dean of Glasgow, was the person selected for this purpose. Having arrived in London, he laid the petition before the Prince, who saw at once the reasonableness of its prayer, and issued a proclamation on the 6th February 1689, ordering the peace to be kept, and forbidding any one from being persecuted or disturbed in the exercise of his religion, whatever that might be. But this proclamation was disregarded by the rabblers, and a serious riot occurred in the Cathedral of Glasgow on the very next Sunday after it was issued. Another representation therefore was made to the Prince of Orange through Dr Fall, the Principal of Glasgow College, who was then in London; but the only satisfaction, which he obtained, was an assurance that the case of the persecuted clergy should be referred to the Meeting of Estates, which was to be held on the 14th of March.

The helpless ministers and their friends looked forward with much anxiety to the approaching day. The Estates were convened, and the first business of importance which they transacted was hearing a letter from William read, recommending them "to enter with all speed upon such consultations with regard to the public good, and to the general interests and inclinations of the people, as may settle them on sure and lasting foundations of peace."

The macer entered the Convention, bearing a letter from the King, dated on board the St Michael, 1st March 1689, enjoining them to loyalty, and threatening them with punishment if they were disobedient. This epistle, however, was "thrown aside with cool indifference," and they passed a vote declaratory of their determination "to continue undissolved until they settle and *secure the Protestant religion*, the *government*, *laws*, and *liberties of the kingdom*." This declaration raised the hopes of the ejected ministers, who were not conscious of having any tendency to "Popery," and who had "*rights* and *liberties*" sanctioned by law, which required the protection of their Legislators. But alas! the bright prospects, which had cheered them, became speedily overcast with a gloomy and portentous cloud. It soon became evident that *theirs* were not the "rights and liberties" which were to be protected. For numbers of the West Country mob came flocking into Edinburgh, and took their station about the place of meeting, where they insulted the Episcopal Nobility and gentry, and especially the Bishops, who claimed a seat in the Convention. The lives of the members were endangered by their tumultuous and violent proceedings, and accordingly the most *obnoxious* were obliged to retire from the meeting, and many of them, Lord Dundee among others, to leave the city, in order to escape the plots formed for their destruction. Having by this method of intimidation cleared the house of all "suspected" persons, and having obtained a body of standing troops under General Mackay, the Convention passed a vote of thanks to those very persons who had "rabbled" the ministers, and complimented them as being "well affected to the *Protestant* interest." This was extremely disheartening to the ejected clergy, and greatly diminished their chance of redress. But the death-blow to their hopes was yet to be inflicted. On the 4th of April the Meeting of Estates passed a vote that King James had "forfaulted" his right to the Crown, and declared the throne vacant. On the 11th they brought in their Claim of Right, in which the "Article" controverted by Bishop Sage

in the Fundamental Charter occurs, and proclaimed William and Mary, King and Queen of Scotland. As yet nothing was directly done either for or against the clergy, and the Hill-men were amusing themselves, as usual, in rabbling them from their livings; but the minister of Ratho, near Edinburgh, having had a *visit* from these rioters, his case, which was specially referred, brought the subject of their sufferings before the Convention. And now came the fatal thrust. On the 13th it was resolved, that King James should be disowned—that all ministers of the gospel should pray *by name* for William and Mary, as the *de jure* sovereigns of the realm—and that the proclamation to this effect should be read by all ministers in Edinburgh after sermon next morning to their people, and by others on such days as appointed, threatening them with deprivation of their benefices if they refused to comply, and promising protection to all "*then* in possession and exercise of their ministry" who should obey it. It was proposed as an amendment by the Duke of Hamilton, the President, that those who had been forcibly extruded from their parishes should be included in this conditional protection of the Government; but this motion was overruled, upon the ground that, if carried, it would "*disoblige the Presbyterians*" and might have very fatal (political) consequences." Accordingly, the "rabbled" ministers and their starving families were altogether omitted.

The Convention of Estates, to which they had been taught to look for redress, turned a deaf ear to their cry, and by drawing away the shelter of the law, gave fresh encouragement to the mob to persevere in their lawless course against them. While this was the case with *them*, matters were not much better with their brethren, who still held their livings. The suddenness of the proclamation, and the importance of the duty required of them, took the Edinburgh clergy quite by surprize, and threw them into a state of perplexing doubt. They did not receive the astounding command till late on the Saturday evening, and they were ordered next morning to dethrone a sovereign, and transfer their allegiance to, and invoke the Divine blessing upon,

another. As was to have been expected, many of them shrank from this difficult point of obedience, and begged for time to consider. But those who did not comply with the edict were called before the Council on the following day, and forthwith deprived, although they offered many substantial pleas in justification of their conduct, *in addition to that of the shortness of time* afforded them for consideration —as for instance that the order to make public prayers for the new King and Queen did not come to them *through their Ordinaries*, whom alone, as conscientious ecclesiastics, they were bound to obey — that William and Mary had not accepted the Crown—and other equally good reasons.[1] All these arguments, however, were of no avail. By a hasty severity, unparalleled in Scottish history, the clergy in all the surrounding neighbourhood, who refused to obey the proclamation of the 13th of April, were ejected from their benefices,[2] and the rabble in the meanwhile were *anticipating* the sharpness of the law. This posture of affairs continued until the Convention was converted into a Parliament, which met under the authority of William and Mary, June 5, 1689. Henceforth the "work" went more rapidly on. On the 19th of July, the doom of the Church as an *establishment* was sealed, by the passing of an Act "abolishing Prelacie." The Parliament adjourned on the 2d of August; and on the 22d of the same month an edict was set forth by the Privy Council, at the instigation of the Earl of Crawford, "allowing and inviting parishioners and other hearers to inform against ministers who had not read the proclamation of the Estates, and prayed for King William and Queen Mary."

Such a general invitation, proceeding from such an authority, had a very ready obedience given to it by an inflamed populace; and as few men are without their secret

[1] See Case of Afflicted Clergy, p. 10, 11, 12, 13.

[2] The ejecting Act of 1662, which Presbyterians characterize as being very cruel, allowed the incumbents *four months* to deliberate about whether they could comply with the conditions upon which their churches might be retained.

enemies, it afforded an ample opportunity for the gratification of private revenge. The result of it was, that in the course of a short time almost all the parochial clergy in the Merse, Lothians, Fife, Stirlingshire, Perthshire, besides some in Aberdeen, Moray, and Ross, were expelled.[1] But the most iniquitous of all the irregular proceedings which occurred at this time, was an inhibitory Act of the Privy Council, passed 29th December, by which the civil courts were enjoined not to take up the cases of the rabbled clergy, who should appeal to them for the recovery of the arrears of their stipends, which had not been paid up before their expulsion. It must be remembered that they had actually done the amount of labour, for which they were justly entitled to remuneration, and the law, if it had been permitted to have free course, would undoubtedly have decided in their favour; but the Act of Council precluded this, and shut their last remaining door of relief.[2] Such were some of the main features of the proceedings which took place at this time. They were full of irregularity and injustice; and though the *same* results would most likely have followed had the Government of the day acted with greater fairness, and only imposed a necessary condition for its own security, this is no extenuation of the measures which *were* adopted for overthrowing the then legal establishment, while it serves to excuse the jealousy and suspicion with which Scottish Episcopalians long regarded the new Government. It cannot be forgotten that the transference of allegiance was in reality their stumbling-block, and that no concessions on the part of the Government could have satisfied their scruples on this point. It is now admitted by all candid persons that William was anxious to have preserved the Episcopal esta-

[1] See Case of the Afflicted Clergy, p. 15.

[2] How different was the conduct of the Government at the Restoration of Episcopacy in 1662. The Parliament, indeed, found that the Covenanting preachers who had got into the livings during the grand Rebellion without presentation from the patron, had no right to them, and declared them vacant. Still they enacted that this should not be "prejudicial to any of those ministers in what they have possessed, or is due to them since their admission."

blishment, and that at the Revolution the majority of the Nation, including by far the greater part of the Nobility and gentry, were either members of the Church, or favourably disposed towards it. As for the reasons which induced the Bishops to refuse to "follow the example of England" as they were *asked* to do, there will be much variety of opinion. But however persons at this day may differ on the subject, they must admit that the *Non-jurors* were not without strong arguments in favour of the stand which they made for King James and *his heirs*—that though *they* may see their way clearly through the intricate question of Revolutionary changes—*others*, without much over-scrupulousness, might find it a very difficult path, and even be *stopped* from walking in it at all.[1] This really occurred; while the great bulk of the clergy of England—many of whom were men of undoubted piety and learning—were rejoiced at the overthrow of the Stuart dynasty, and the accession of the Prince of Orange, and even went so far as regard the Revolution as a work with the approval of Heaven; some few of the English Bishops and inferior clergy, and all the Bishops of Scotland, with a large proportion of *their* clergy, took an opposite view of the whole affair, grieved at the downfall of the Stuarts as the most untoward event which could have happened to the Nation—and regarded the disaffection and desertion of their

[1] As an instance of the perplexity in which men of thought were involved at this time, we may mention the famous Dr South, who, when urged to sign the invitation to the Prince of Orange, refused, alleging that *prayers and tears were the only means it became him to employ against his Sovereign*. And although he afterwards acknowledged the legality of the succession when James had withdrawn, and took the oaths to the new King and Queen, he yet refused the Mitre, on its being proposed to him to succeed one of the deprived Bishops. See "Literature of the Church of England," by Rev. Richard Cattermore, B. D., London, 1844, vol. ii. p. 444. In reference to the above instance, Mr C. writes—"In common with all loyal and patriotic Englishmen, but especially the members of clerical profession, South was at this time torn by profound anxiety at the prospect presented by the Established Church, and at the posture of the national affairs in general." We adduce this remark to prove to persons who are disposed to view the conduct of the Bishops and Clergy of Scotland with severity, that theirs was a path beset with extreme difficulty, and that the greatest minds in England were puzzled how to act in that extraordinary emergency.

subjects as a National sin of the deepest dye. Whatever view, then, we repeat, may be taken in this day, of the steps of the latter class—it is impossible for any candid mind to withhold the tribute of admiration to that integrity of principle, which made them submit to the loss of all things for conscience sake—to relinquish power, station, wealth, honours —all those things which men crave and labour for, and to face persecutions, misrepresentation, and poverty—those dreadful evils from which the human heart recoils.[1] What might have been the present state of the Church in Scotland, had her Bishops, at the Revolution, adopted another line of conduct, is a matter of allowable speculation. Supported by the authority of the Civil power, and possessed of the revenues to which she was justly entitled, it is reasonable to suppose that she would have retained her hold in the land, and thus many of those schisms which deform the face of Scotland, might have been prevented; but when we consider the opinions of the statesmen of those days, it is to be feared that her retention of the seat of power would have involved the sacrifice of much that is excellent in her system, and Catholic in her Standards. Whereas, by her separation from the State — although poor and despised, and bearing the Cross—she retained her original freedom, and deprived of the "arm of flesh," was thrown altogether upon the care and protection of Him, who promised to be with His church "unto the end of the world." All that human efforts could do to extinguish her was done, but done in vain: Though persecuted, she was not forsaken —though cast down, she could not be destroyed. In the

[1] It will scarcely be believed that in violation of every principle of that "charity" which "hopeth all things," and in the utter disregard of the rule of our Divine Master, "by their fruits ye shall know them," a writer of great note and in much admiration with *Presbyterians*, has not scrupled to call the bishops and clergy of that day "time servers, court flatterers, and ready, for any thing I can discover in their writings, to fall in with Popery itself, to please the King, and *keep their places!*" Wodrow, vol. iv. p. 468. Either what a mist of prejudice and ignorance must have obscured, or what a degree of malice must have poisoned the mind of him, who, in spite of facts, could thus write of those venerable sufferers!

exercise of that spiritual authority which the rulers of the earth neither gave, nor had power to take away, her Bishops continued to govern the Apostolic Communion over which they were the *divinely appointed* overseers; and her inferior clergy to teach and administer the ordinances of religion to those who steadfastly continued within her pale. As was to have been expected from persons of their principles, the Archbishops and Bishops, who were ejected at this time, went into quiet retirement, and meekly submitted to their reverse of worldly fortune, and to what they considered, the melancholy change which had occurred in the civil politics of the Nation.[1] And here it may be remarked, that the conduct of the triumphant party in the Government towards them, was by no means conciliatory or merciful, and shews more forcibly than any arguments, the weakness of the foundations upon which it was established, which required to be propped up by arbitrary enactments, and illiberal conduct. It is not attempted to be denied that the *then* ruling powers were right in using every precaution for their own security; but had they exercised more lenity towards their fallen enemies, the end which they desired, would have been more easily gained. In their parsimonious treatment of the ejected Prelates, they contrast badly *even* with the zealots of the Reformation, who were not particularly remarkable for feeling and generosity. *They*, while sacrilegiously parcelling out the property of the Church among their greedy adherents, nevertheless considered that it would be disgraceful to leave the "Popish Prelates," as they called them, penniless and destitute, and consequently allowed them to "hold and possess two-thirds of their benefices, *on their own calculation*, to their dying day." Whereas the Government of William and Mary swept all the revenues of the Bishops' rents into the Royal Exchequer,[2] and except in one or two cases, as in that

[1] For short notices of the ejected Bishops, after the Revolution, see Lawson's History of the Episcopal Church from the Revolution to the Present Time, page 30-36.

[2] It is not generally understood that Scotland, in a pecuniary point of view, is not relieved by the abolition of Episcopacy. It still continues to pay a pittance to the Church, and *the support of the Apostolic order*. The revenues

of Archbishop Patterson, whose influence through his family connexions was powerful, and of Bishop Rose of Edinburgh, whose personal friends and popularity with all classes, were many and great, they heartlessly permitted the disestablished members of the Episcopal College to struggle with poverty, and to depend upon the voluntary liberality of their friends.[1]

It is time now to turn from the Church in general, to her illustrious son, the subject of this Sketch. When the persecutions of the Rabblers, and the unexpected occurrences in the State, rendered it imprudent and useless for him to remain in Glasgow, he came to Edinburgh, the seat of Government, in order *at least* to obtain protection for his

in every See are now as regularly levied as if it was filled by a successor of the Apostles! The *Crown* swallows up all the Bishops' rents, except those of the Dioceses of Argyll and of The Isles. The emoluments of *these* Bishoprics, by a gift from Queen Anne, dated July 14, 1705, were granted during pleasure to the Moderator and Provincial Synod of Argyll in the Presbyterian Establishment, in trust, to be by them applied for instituting schools, repairing churches, educating and training ministers, &c. &c. They are regularly collected by a person appointed by the Synod, and appropriated to the purposes for which they were granted. We understand that the small sum, which is *irregularly* doled out to the present Bishops in Scotland, is paid from the Scottish Exchequer from the rents of the property which belonged to their ecclesiastical predecessors; and in various *influential* quarters it has lately been mooted, whether, if a proper application were made to the Throne, this trifling grant might not be more regularly paid, and even increased in amount. When it is remembered what large sums the Roman Catholics and *Presbyterians* in Ireland annually receive from the State, it is scarcely credible that a well-supported petition from the Scottish Episcopal Church, *as a body*, for a participation in the liberal bounty of the Government, would be rejected. At all events, it is worth while to make the request, and we should hope that the matter only requires consideration, to induce the wealthy and aristocratic members of the Episcopal Church in Scotland to bestir themselves in it.

[1] In England, where the vacant Sees were immediately filled by other duly consecrated occupants, it was scarcely to have been expected that the Government could have provided for the Non-jurors; but in Scotland, where the Bishops had no successors, it is impossible to offer any excuse for their illiberality towards those conscientious and venerable men; and we are almost warranted in charging them with a spirit of revenge, the worst feature which a governing power could assume or manifest, especially towards quiet and consistent enemies.

person. Though in England the Revolution was expected, and a regularly organized plan had been devised preparatory to its breaking out, and though some of the Scottish Presbyterians, who were in Holland, had been plotting against James, and holding a secret correspondence with the leaders of their party at home, it is well known that the Bishops and clergy—indeed the majority of the Scottish nation—were quite unprepared for the important event, and when the news of the invasion of the Prince of Orange was communicated, they were in a manner stunned by the intelligence. Even after matters had passed the crisis—when James had retired into France, and his daughter and her husband had been proclaimed in his stead, the partizans of the unfortunate monarch never for an instant doubted that the cloud which had gathered over the fortunes of his House would speedily pass away, and that in a short time he would be reseated on his throne. Buoying themselves up with this delusive hope, they set about forming schemes for hastening what they considered so desirable an event. It was not until after the battle of Killiecrankie, and when the master-spirit who guided their deliberations, and cemented their strifes, had fallen on that fatal field of victory, that the more judicious of the Jacobites began to fear that the sun of the House of Stuart had set for ever. Even after the death of Dundee we find that the devoted friends of James were plotting for his return, and, while an heir in the direct line existed, some of them did not despair of seeing him reinstated in his paternal rights.[1]

[1] As instances of this, we need not call the reader's attention to the Enterprizes of 1715 and "the '45," in which the representatives of many of the best and wealthiest families in Scotland lost their lives and fortunes. To show the tenacity, almost amounting to a weakness, with which the ultra-Jacobites adhered to their favourite hope, in despite of circumstances, a venerable living Bishop, the last of his generation, relates a traditional anecdote of the father of Mr Lindsay (the clergyman to whom Boswell mentions that Johnson paid respect, when he observed him habited in his cassock), Episcopal minister of St Andrews in the last century. The old gentleman to his dying day expected the happy hour to arrive when "the Prince" should ascend his father's throne, and actually gave him-

This hope of the return of James, and the re-establishment of the Church, serves to account for an act of Mr Sage, when he was obliged to quit Glasgow, which might otherwise seem questionable—his carrying off with him the Diocesan Records, containing an account of the ecclesiastical affairs of that Diocese from the year 1581 to 1682. Being Diocesan Clerk, and regarding the local disturbances, then occurring as mere temporary outbreaks which would soon subside, he naturally adopted what he considered the best means of providing for the safety of the important documents which had been entrusted to his care, by keeping them in his own possession, and privately conveying them to the place where he was to reside. The *same* reason induced him to retain them even after the Revolution, and at his death to bequeath them to his friend Bishop Rose, doubtless in trust to be brought to light and restored when Episcopacy should be again established! Whether the venerable Bishop had not such sanguine expectations of this event as his zealous and learned Presbyter, or whether his directions concerning the Records were not attended to by his friends after his death, does not appear. The documents themselves, however, were sold with the rest of that Prelate's Library to a Mr M'Intosh, Episcopal clergyman at Doune, and were not regained by the Presbytery until after the elapse of a whole century. Having been restored, they were deposited in the Session-House of the Laigh or Tron Kirk of Glasgow, but when that edifice was consumed by fire in 1793, "they were all injured, and some of them entirely lost."[1]

self great uneasiness about matters of Court etiquette, fearing lest, during the long interval which had elapsed, his manners might have become rusty, and he should not cut a good figure when presented to his sovereign after the "*Restoration*."

[1] The following extracts from the Records of the Presbytery of Glasgow, with which the Editor has been furnished by his friend the Rev. J. W. Ferguson, Minister of St Peter's, Edinburgh, and Synod Clerk of the Diocese of Edinburgh, may be interesting, as containing an account of the recovery of the Records which Mr Sage secreted after the Revolution, and a list of the contents of the several volumes:—"*At Glasgow, 7th December* 1791.—

When Mr Sage took up his residence in Edinburgh, neither his inclination nor his zeal would permit him to lead

Sederunt, Mr Pollock, Moderator, Dr Taylor, Dr Porteous, Mr Balfour, &c. It having been represented to the Presbytery that a considerable number of volumes of the Record of the Presbytery of Glasgow, from the year 1580 for more than a hundred years, are in the hands of Henry Stirling, Esq. at Keir Park, or some other person, the Presbytery resolve to do everything competent to them to recover said Record; and in order thereto, appoint the Moderator, Dr Porteous, Dr Taylor, and Mr Balfour, or any two of them, as a Committee to correspond in name of the Presbytery with Mr Stirling, and the said Committee, or any two of them, to take whatever steps may be necessary for effectuating of the said Record. Dr Porteous is appointed Convener of the Committee, with power to them of adjournment from time to time, as they may think proper; and the Presbytery appoint the said Committee to report at next meeting.

"*At Glasgow, 4th January* 1792.—Sederunt—Mr Pollock, Moderator, Dr Gillies, Dr Taylor, Dr Porteous, Mr Burns, Dr Lockhart, Mr Balfour, &c.—The Rev. Dr Porteous, Convener of the Committee appointed at last meeting for recovering the old Record, gave in the Report, whereof the tenor follows:—'*Glasgow, 3d January* 1792.—Present, Drs Taylor and Porteous, the Committee appointed to attempt the recovery of the Register of this Presbytery, agree to report as follows:—That they have corresponded with Mr Henry Stirling at Keir Park, acting for Mr M'Intosh, Episcopal clergyman at Doune, who having purchased the whole of Bishop Rose's Library, was put in possession of the volumes after mentioned, for restoring which Mr Stirling thought Mr M'Intosh entitled to a recompence of ten guineas. The Committee, considering that the said Record is a matter of public importance, agreed to state the facts relating to it in a letter to the Lord Provost, which has been followed by an Act of the City Council, ordaining the ten guineas to be paid out of their funds. In consequence of this, the Committee have been put in possession of nine folio volumes of the following description, which will be delivered to the Presbytery with this Report. Vol. I.—This volume is not bound, but roughly put together under an old parchment cover. It begins with a record of ecclesiastical transactions from June 1581 till June 1582. These transactions refer to the counties of Lanark, Renfrew, and Dunbarton, and seem to have been conducted at Glasgow by a kind of Synodical meeting, which was held very frequently sometimes once in each week, and was called "The Kirk." The remainder of this volume, which is by much the greater part of it, contains the Register of the Session of Glasgow, from 28th November 1583 to October 1592. Vol. II. contains the Records of the Exercise at Glasgow, which was the first name given to classical meetings, afterwards named Presbyteries. It contains also the Acts of the Kirk, or of Synods, and of General Assemblies relating to these three counties above mentioned. It begins on the 19th day of November 1585, and ends 4th October 1592, about the

a life of ease and inactivity. Driven by violence from the proper sphere of his labours, he eagerly embraced every opportunity which presented itself of applying the culture of true religion to the souls of his countrymen, and of supporting the cause of the Church. While any of the parochial incumbents in the Scottish metropolis retained possession of their churches, he was in the habit of assisting them in the performance of Divine Service, and of occasionally relieving them from the burden of a sermon ; and afterwards, when the " inquisitorial tribunal" of the Kirk, acting upon the authority delegated to them by the Parliament of 1690, had " purged out all *insufficient, negligent, scandalous, and erroneous ministers*," i. e. had, by a system of continual vexation and insult, deprived all the Episcopal clergy in the city, both compliers and noncompliers,[1] of their livings, Mr Sage was appointed

time the Presbyterian Church Government was established by Act of Parliament. Vols. III. IV. and V. contain the Register of the Presbytery of Glasgow from 24th October 1592 to 10th January 1627. After this period the Record is wanted for twenty years, but the Committee are not without hopes that it may yet be recovered. Vol. VI. contains the Register of the Presbytery of Glasgow, from 2d April 1647 to 11th October 1650. Vol. VII. contains a Record of transactions during a part of the same period which is included in Vol. VIII. ; but how far they are the same, or wherein they differ (has not been discovered—*Cleland*), the Committee have not had sufficient opportunities to discover. Vol. VIII. contains the Register of the Presbytery of Glasgow, from 11th December 1650 to 15th August 1654, after which there is a deficiency for about nine years. Vol. IX. contains the Register of the Presbytery of Glasgow under Episcopacy, from 3d June 1663 to 20th September 1682. (This volume (IX.) containing the Record of the Church during the days of Burnet, Leighton, and Ross, was said, in 1793, after having been injured by fire, to be " generally legible by a person careful and accustomed to the style."—J. W. F.) The Committee have only to add, that the Presbytery are much indebted to Mr Henry Stirling. He was the first who brought these volumes to the knowledge of the Presbytery after having been amissing for a hundred years, and as far as was consistent with his duty to the clergyman in possession, has behaved with great attention to the public interest, and great regard to this Presbytery. (Signed) ' William Porteous, *Modr. of Committee.*' "

[1] It was usual for the leaders of the Presbyterians of that day to apply the above-mentioned epithets to the Episcopal clergy, and that the reader may form some idea of the grounds for these serious charges—some idea of what constituted " insufficiency," " negligence," &c. &c. in the opinions

to the pastoral care of one of the principal "meeting-houses" in Edinburgh. The members of the Church, when they saw the clergy expelled from their parish churches, very properly fitted up places of worship or chapels in different parts of the city, in which they might enjoy the benefit of authorised preaching, and have the Sacraments "rightly and duly administered." An inscription over the door of St Paul's chapel, in an alley off the High Street called Carrubber's Close, intimates that it was erected in 1689; and there is a tradition that the Bishop of Edinburgh, when he was driven from his cathedral of St Giles, used to minister in this less imposing edifice. A recent historian, however, informs us that this tradition is groundless, as "Bishop Rose did not statedly officiate to any particular congregation as pastor after the Revolution." Now, as there could not have been many of these "meeting-houses" erected at this time—probably that in Carrubber's

of those worthies, we subjoin a few of the "libels" that were raised against various clergymen. The minister of Saline was accused and deposed for recommending such a "superstitious and erroneous book" as the *Whole Duty of Man*, to his people. The minister of Abbotshall was libelled for opposing the Westminster Confession, and using the one authorised by the Diocesan Synod of Edinburgh, afterwards enlarged by the learned and eminently pious Bishop Scougall of Aberdeen. Others were libelled for using the Lord's Prayer and Doxology after the Psalms. The incumbent of Ladykirk was deposed for "having said that the Covenant was no better than a band of rebellion." Another was charged with being guilty of the scandal of "whistling." But the general object of attack, which occupied a prominent position in every indictment, was that the clergy had entered on their livings by presentation from a patron, and collation and institution from a Bishop, which, they boldly affirmed, was "contrary to the Word of God, to the constitution of this Kirk, to the Acts of Assemblies, and to the land's solemn engagements." Such were the *crimes* which in the eyes of the triumphant Presbyterians constituted "insufficiency," "erroneousness," "scandal," &c. &c.; and upon these frivolous and vexatious pretences, the unfortunate men, who were willing to comply with the terms of the Parliament, were deposed, and turned out of their livings. So anxious were the "Inquisition" to deprive the clergy, that they would not wait until their places could be supplied, declaring that "*it was better that the Temple of the Lord did lie some time unbuilt and unrepaired, than be reared up by Gibeonites and Samaritans*," i. e. Episcopal ministers!

Close and another in Skinner's Close were the only ones—it is more than a *conjecture* that the "meeting-house, thronged with people of the best quality and sense," to which, Bishop Gillan says, Mr Sage was invited, was one of the churches in the above-mentioned localities, either the present St Paul's, or that in which the late Bishop Abernethy Drummond officiated. In the absence of positive proof, we can only hazard it as an interesting probability, that one or other of these places was the scene of Mr Sage's labours at that time. It is certain, however, that he, whose writings are so deservedly esteemed, was not less admired as a preacher, and from his eloquent discourses the members of the Church, who attended his ministrations, derived much edification and comfort. They have been thus characterized by one who was capable of forming a correct judgment concerning this zealous minister of the gospel, and the character given him shows that he was in the true sense of the term an useful preacher.

> "Extensive sense still into small compass drew,
> Said what was just, and always something new."

But this excellent pastor was not long permitted to pursue the even tenor of his way, in fulfilling his pastoral duties to the honour of God and the benefit of his fellow-Christians. The relentless jealousy of the Presbyterians, not content with driving the ministers from the parish churches, pursued them even into the privacy of the "meeting-houses;" and with that selfish intolerance which was the main feature of all their proceedings, they resolved that the faithful people, who adhered to the Church, should be deprived of the valued privilege of hearing the Word and receiving the Sacraments from those persons, whom they had been taught to regard as the authorized priests of God. Accordingly, Mr Sage and others of his brethren were dragged before the Privy-Council, and ordered to take the Oath of Allegiance and Assurance; and when they candidly avowed that their conscientious scruples would not permit them to comply with the mandate, they were not only "forbidden to exercise any

part of their ministerial function within the city, but also banished thence by an Act of the Council." It must be remembered, that those respectable men had already suffered the "loss of all things" without complaint, and, passively obeying the rigorous laws of the Convention, had retired into private life that they might possess "a conscience void of offence;" but even here they were not allowed to remain in peace. This is mentioned merely to show that Presbyterianism has not always been that friend of "civil and religious liberty," and "freedom of conscience," which its warm supporters and advocates in later times would persuade us to believe.[1]

After the banishment of our author and his clerical brethren from Edinburgh, he withdrew into the retirement of the small country town of Kinross, on the banks of Lochleven. His main inducement in selecting this place of residence arose from the fact that in Kinross and its neighbourhood, two of his most intimate friends resided—Mr Christie and Sir William Bruce, both of whom he knew would be happy to receive him, in the dark day of his distress, under their hospitable roofs. The former gentleman had been the parochial incumbent of Kinross before the Revolution, and though deprived of his benefice for not complying with the terms of the famous Proclamation by the Convention on the 13th of April 1689, he still continued to reside within the parish, which had been the scene of his

[1] It is an historical fact that William and his Government would have exercised much more clemency to the Jacobites, had they not been urged on to severity by those who hated Episcopacy; and it is admitted by all candid persons, that most of those who suffered at the Revolution, suffered for their love and attachment to the Church. In various contemporary pamphlets, we find numerous proofs that the persecution at this time was the effect of religious party spirit, which was far less merciful than the political hostilities of the State rulers. Indeed, the sufferers frequently appealed to the Government for protection; the want of which we may reasonably conclude was in a great measure the cause of their longing for the restoration of the exiled Family, which, with all its faults, was not illiberal in matters of religion, or disinclined to tolerate those who differed from it in opinion.

labours, and to which he was doubtless bound by many interesting ties. Concerning this excellent individual we unfortunately know but little. That little, however, proves that he was a person of considerable attainments in learning and piety. Had he not been possessed of these qualities, it is by no means probable that Sage would have chosen him for a friend—the friend with whom he particularly delighted to dwell—that he would have been selected by the Bishops of the Church as one worthy of being advanced to the high office of the Episcopate, in a critical emergency. For we find that he was consecrated, April 28, 1709, and, by an odd coincidence, his friend Sage was one of the three Prelates, by whom he was invested with the "Office of a Bishop in the Church of God." He died in 1718. The other of Mr Sage's friends, Sir William Bruce, is better known. Born during the troubled reign of Charles I., he was witness to all the irregular proceedings which occurred in Scotland, but too young to take an active part in the civil and religious excitement which prevailed. No one was more instrumental than Sir William in bringing about the Restoration. It is said that on one occasion, when he had an interview with Monk after the death of Cromwell, he represented the present distractions of the country, and the glory that would accrue to the restorer of the lawful heir to the throne, and of the ecclesiastical establishment of England which is interwoven with the monarchy, in such lively colours, and with so much genuine patriotic feeling, that he melted the heart of the stern leader of the Puritans, who opened his mind to the young and loyal Scot, and expressed his intention, when the opportunity offered itself, of serving the King. The bright hope, held out from such a quarter, was soon communicated to his Royal Master, who in the course of a short time was restored to his rights; and, after the Restoration, Charles II. was not unmindful of the person who had done him such signal service in the day of adversity. He conferred upon him the dignity of a Baronet, and appointed him to lucrative and honourable offices. Bound therefore by gratitude as well as duty to the Stuart

Dynasty, he did not approve of the change of Government in 1688, and was always regarded with suspicion by the new rulers for his well known attachment to the exiled Family, while the Presbyterians disliked him for his avowed contempt for their religious system, and his devoted love to the Church and her suffering clergy.[1]

Such were the two persons with whom we are informed that our author went to reside, after his banishment from Edinburgh. Knowing the principles and opinions of the three friends, we can easily imagine the subjects which were frequently discussed and mournfully dwelt upon in the splendid apartments of Kinross House, and perhaps made the subject of fervent and united prayer in the more unpretending study of the deposed pastor. His biographer says of Mr Sage at this time—"In the society of those his intimate and dear friends he comforted himself under his bad circumstances and cross accidents of life, which did not near so much afflict him as did the public calamities of the Church and country." He saw the monarchy overthrown, and the voice of the people preferred to the voice of God—(of course we are to be understood as representing things as they must have appeared to the eyes of a person of Sage's principles and

[1] As a reward for his services, Charles II. in 1660, appointed Sir William Bruce to be Clerk to the Bills—an office in the Court of Session, the emolument of which in those days was much greater than it is at present. Being an excellent architect, he was also made Master of the King's Works, and finished the Palace of Holyrood as it now stands. In 1668, he was created Sir William Bruce of Balcaskie in Fife. Having afterwards acquired from the Earl of Morton the lands and barony of Kinross, he was ever known by that title, and was made heritable Sheriff of the county. Near Kinross he built a splendid residence, and expended a considerable sum in beautifying and improving his grounds. He married Mary, daughter of Sir James Halkett of Pitfirran, Baronet, by whom he had several children, and died in 1710 at a great age. See Sibbald's History of the Sheriffdoms of Fife and Kinross, Edin. 1710, fol. Douglas' Baronage, vol. i. As an instance of Sir William's principles, it is said that he was expelled from the Parliament which met at Edinburgh in 1702, for maintaining, in reply to a motion for an Act to secure the Presbyterian Church Government, that *Presbytery was inconsistent with Monarchy!* This, perhaps, is an extreme view to us, but a greater man than Sir William—King James VI.—expressed himself in almost the same terms.

prejudices, rather than as they actually were),—he beheld the civil foundations of a great kingdom rashly shaken, without being able to see those mighty props supplied, which are now owned by the wisest to be the bulwarks of our glorious constitution—He witnessed the rise and progress, and had to endure the violence, of a political storm, which seemed to rage with devastating power, but was not permitted to view its happy termination. If it destroyed in its course, the wisdom of subsequent legislators has improved the opportunity afforded them by its ravages, by rearing a system, in which the elements of social order are more equally regulated, and from which we derive blessings of incalculable magnitude—He saw a society, which he conscientiously believed to have been founded by Divine authority, for communicating to the people of Scotland privileges of momentous interest—which he believed to be the guardian of the Sacred Scriptures—the only legitimate dispenser of the Sacraments and other means of grace—He saw that society, a branch of Christ's Holy Catholic Church, trampled under foot, persecuted, and despised by the rulers of the land—He saw its governors, the lineal successors of those to whom "the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven" had been committed by their Divine Master, and with whom He had promised to be "unto the end of the world"—he saw them and their clergy, the duly commissioned ambassadors of Christ, insulted, and their authority and teaching nationally disowned—He beheld a polity, of recent date, and associated in his mind with shameful acts, erected upon the ruins of the Church, whose origin he had been accustomed to trace to a heavenly source. He saw a nation involved in the heinous guilt of rejecting those whom Christ had sent, and deliberately dissevering itself from His body mystical on earth. The considerations which these sad calamities suggested, were sufficiently sorrowful to have weighed down a mind imbued with less of the spirit of genuine Christian charity than Mr Sage possessed; and we do not wonder that they prompted him to seek the society of friends who would sympathise with him, and share the burden of a real

Churchman's grief, as he witnessed such distressing occurrences, and lived in such gloomy times. It must not be supposed, however, that he abandoned himself to vain repinings, as he gazed upon the melancholy prospect. That faith and that hope, which are such bright ornaments of the Christian character, shone conspicuously in him at this time, and yielded him consolation, such as no human means—not even the "precious balm" of friendship—could impart. We are told that "he possessed his soul in patience, and adored the Divine Providence with perfect submission to the will of God, being fully persuaded that the great Governor of the world is just in all his ways, and orders all things so as they shall tend to the good of those who love Him."

While officiating in the "meeting-house" at Edinburgh, he had commenced the polemical warfare which ended only with his life, and had sent forth some of those controversial works which are such lasting monuments of his learning, abilities, and zeal. It seems to have been a principle with this eminent defender of Episcopacy to suffer no assailant, in the least worthy of an opponent, to remain long unmatched in the arena of controversy, and to permit no public circumstance to pass by in silence, if, by interfering, there was the slightest chance of either vindicating or advancing "the suffering Church." Thus, wherever he was, his watchful eye was intently fixed upon the movements of the enemy, and closely following them through all their tortuous paths; while his ready pen, directed by learning and zeal, was exerted in providing a counteracting remedy against their erroneous statements and hostile designs. Although, therefore, he had previously written one or two able pamphlets, which seemed to be called for by passing events,[1] his leisure and retirement at Kinross afforded him an opportunity of executing a larger

[1] As, for instance, "An Account of the Establishment of Presbyterian Government by the Parliament of Scotland, anno 1690, &c. to which is added, A Summary of the Visitation of the Universities, in a Fifth Letter from a Gentleman in Edinburgh to his Friend in London;" and "The Second and Third of the Letters" so frequently referred to in the Fundamental Charter.

and more important work. Accordingly, at this time he devoted himself to writing the learned treatise which forms the subject of the present volume, and when it was finished he sent it to London to be published; for, as he says himself in another place, "it were easier to pluck a star from the firmament than to get any thing published in Scotland against the tyranny of Presbytery, or in vindication of Episcopacy." The utmost care was used to conceal the name of the author of these *offensive* Works, and it was hoped that the distance of the place of publication would have assisted to screen him from the notice of his enemies. In this however, his friends were disappointed, and upon an early occasion he had a tolerably strong proof given him, that he was a "marked man," and had stirred up the wrath of the Presbyterians against himself.

Being actuated by a great desire to see some dear friends in Edinburgh, and having some private business to transact there, he ventured to revisit the metropolis; but he had no sooner appeared upon the street than a Privy Councillor,[1] "whose greatest pleasure was to persecute the Episcopal clergy," lodged intimation against him, and being apprehended, *he* was held to bail to quit the town forthwith, although the authorities connived at many of those who had been previously banished with him, remaining in it. Expelled again from Edinburgh by this severe order, he returned to Kinross, and still further employed his learned and eloquent pen in defence of the Church, and in confirmation of her principles. At this time he reared that invincible bulwark of Diocesan Episcopacy, entitled the "Cyprianic Age," the appearance of which sharpened the resentment of the Presbyterians, and made them doubly anxious to secure and silence so strenuous and powerful an opponent. Unfortunately, an opportunity soon offered for that purpose, which had almost been successful. Sir William Bruce had been apprehended, upon a suspicion of corresponding with the

[1] Perhaps Monro of Foulis, whose animosity towards the clergy was fierce and unrelenting. See "the Second of the Four Letters," p. 26, for an instance of his violence.

Royal Family in France, and was kept as a State prisoner in Edinburgh Castle. For some private reasons, Sage, when the time of his bail was out, rashly hazarded a visit to the capital, and his enemies being made aware of it, rejoiced at the prospect of getting him into their hands, intending to give him his option either of a common prison, or banishment from his native land. His known intimacy with the obnoxious Sir William was the pretext, which they put forward against him; and the Privy Councillor, already mentioned, was the instrument, by whose authority they hoped to accomplish their ends. This "honourable" personage commanded the Captain of the Town Guard to take a party of soldiers, and to make diligent search for the Reverend Divine in the houses of his friends. After one or two hair-breadth escapes, Mr Sage managed to elude their vigilance, and hid himself among the Grampian Hills, where "under the feigned name of Mr Jackson, and the plea of requiring bracing air and goat's milk for his health," he lurked many months, until his constant and faithful friend Sir William was set at liberty, and the wrath of his enemies was cooled by time.

Soon after this period, he was requested by Anne Countess of Callendar, and grand-daughter of the famous Marquis of Montrose, to become her domestic chaplain, and preceptor to her son, the young Earl.[1] The circumstances of our author at this time were such as to cause him gladly to avail himself of so eligible a situation, by which, while he was serving his Maker and benefitting his fellow-creatures, he would be prevented from being any longer a burden to his valued friends. Bishop Gillan incidentally mentions a custom of his during his residence at Callendar House, which shews how strictly he observed the rules of the Church, and speaks volumes for the principles of the excellent family to which he was then attached—viz., that "he had daily reading of prayers

[1] James fourth Earl of Callendar was served heir to his father in 1693, and succeeded his uncle as fifth Earl of Linlithgow in 1695. He joined the Earl of Mar in 1715, and forfeited his estates. His daughter married Lord Kilmarnock, who was beheaded with Lord Balmerino on Tower Hill.

and preaching on holydays." But neither the regular performance of the duties of his sacred office, nor the laborious task of instructing his pupil, which, we might think, would have been occupation enough for one, whose health was by no means robust, could hinder him from active exertion, when the welfare of the Church demanded the exercise of his learning and talents. At this time, therefore, we find him again appearing in the lists of controversy, and sending forth the "Vindication" of the "Cyprianic Age," which had been answered by Gilbert Rule, whose principal fame arises from his having been the frequent, but vanquished opponent of the learned subject of this memoir.[1]

When the Earl of Linlithgow had finished his studies, Mr Sage accepted the invitation of Sir John Stewart, Bart., of Grandtully in Perthshire, to enter his family as chaplain, and in this gentleman's house he continued performing the pastoral duties until that event occurred, which, independently of his learning and abilities, entitles him to the veneration of Churchmen. But before narrating the consecration of Bishop Sage, we must take a hasty glance at the circumstances of the Church, and the diminished members of the Episcopal college.

We have already alluded to the hardships, to which the Episcopal clergy were subjected, even after they had been

[1] Gilbert Rule succeeded Dr Alexander Monro, as Principal of the University of Edinburgh, after the Revolution. He had been a zealous son of the Covenant in its day of triumph, but during the tyranny of Cromwell, which clipped the wings of the Covenanting party, he veered towards Independency, and was made sub-Principal of King's College, Aberdeen, by General Monk. After the Restoration, he became minister of Alnwick in Northumberland, but was ejected by the "*Bartholomew*" Act of 1662, and having repaired to Scotland, was confined in the Bass prison for transgressing the commands of the Privy Council. He was released upon giving bond that he would quit the country within eight days; and after his release he went to Holland, studied medicine, and took his degrees. He practised afterwards at Berwick, but getting into trouble there, he accepted a *ministerial* call to Dublin, where he remained as a preacher until after the Revolution, at which crisis he returned to his native country, and on account of his frequent controversies, obtained the sobriquet of the "Vindicator of the Kirk."

ejected from their livings. But the most severe blow was inflicted on them in 1695. An Act of Parliament was then passed "prohibiting and discharging any Episcopal minister from *baptizing any children*, or solemnizing marriage betwixt any parties in all time coming, under pain of imprisonment" and perpetual exile! Like the Apostles when prohibited to preach any more in the name of Jesus of Nazareth, the clergy chose rather to obey the voice of God than the commands of men, and using every precautionary method for avoiding detection, they went about administering the Sacraments of religion, and preaching the gospel to those, who knew the value of their spiritual authority, and adhered through "evil report and good report" to their ministry. In vain did the Episcopalians expostulate against the severity of the enactment, and represent it as striking at the very root of their Faith, which required them at least to have the Sacraments performed by proper administrators—the Government was deaf to their earnest entreaties, and their religious opponents exulted over their depressed condition. In this state they remained until the death of William in 1702, when a brighter day dawned, and induced them to hope that the time was now approaching when they would obtain "gentler and more equitable treatment." Queen Anne ascended the throne of her father, and her known attachment to the doctrine and discipline of the Anglican Church, led the members of the suffering sister Church in Scotland to expect that she would sympathize with them, and shelter them under her powerful protection, from the tyranny of their schismatical countrymen; nor were they altogether disappointed. Although the expected relief did not arrive so soon as they could have wished, the soothing answer which the Queen gave to their address and petition in the beginning of her reign, and her pointed discouragement of all legal prosecutions against them, greatly ameliorated the distressed state of the Church, and revived the drooping spirits of her members. The bare idea of toleration being granted to the fallen Church—an event to which the course of things pointed as likely to happen—roused the fears and animosity

of the Presbyterians; and their leading ministers, in their sermons on public occasions, and through the press, inveighed loudly against it. Hence in 1703, a fierce polemical strife raged on this subject, and various combatants appeared on the field—such as the *renowned* David Williamson and Mr George Meldrum, on the side of the Kirk. Among the foremost of the defenders of the Church, and of the rights of conscience on this occasion, Mr Sage came forth, and seizing upon Mr Meldrum's "Reasons against Tolerations," he overturned them by that masterly reply so well known under the title of the "Reasonableness of Toleration," which demonstrates not only the sound, uncompromizing Church principles of our author, but the solidity of his learning, and the acuteness of his reasoning powers. Though Mr Sage did not live to reap the full reward of his labour, his writings had an effect even at the moment. The Church for a year or more "had rest" from outward persecution, and a mighty change was working in the human mind with regard to the futility of the endeavour to fetter the conscience by Acts of Parliament, and to coerce a man against his convictions to own whatever system of religion the civil powers may choose to establish.

During this brief period of tranquillity, the attention of the Governors of the Church was turned upon themselves, and one of the most anxious subjects which occupied their minds was the duty of providing for the future succession of the Episcopal Order. By the death of the aged Primate, Dr. Ross, in 1704, the number of Bishops was reduced to *five*, most of whom, worn out with years and calamity, were tottering on the brink of the grave. In order, therefore, that the Apostolic line might not be interrupted, the venerable survivors resolved to commit the sacred "Deposit" with which they had been entrusted, to "other faithful men, apt to teach and govern." In consequence of this determination, Mr Sage, and Mr Fullarton the ejected minister of Paisley, were selected by the Fathers of the Church, as persons fit to be elevated to the Episcopate, and were duly and canonically consecrated "*in sacrario*" of the house of Arch-

bishop Paterson at Edinburgh, on the 25th of January 1705; the Archbishop, Bishop Rose of Edinburgh, and Bishop Douglas of Dunblane performing the holy rite.[1]

While these persons were thus solemnly invested with the Episcopate, an agreement was entered into that they were not to have Diocesan authority, or to interfere at all in the government of the Church. Expediency and the exigency of the Church were the inducements which led the Bishops to insist on this stipulation, and to make a *temporary* deviation from the usual rule. It answered, indeed, the immediate purpose, for which it was designed by those excellent men, but like all other plans founded upon a short sighted policy, it was at length productive of great evil, and involved the Church in confusion and unseemly disputes. The controversies between the "College Party" and the assertors of "Diocesan Episcopacy," are too well known to require further notice here.

Being raised to the Episcopate, Bishop Sage seems to have continued in the Grandtully family, executing his high and useful duties for the benefit of the limited circle around him. But now he first experienced the ill effects of his laborious exertions, and unwearied anxiety during life, which had gradually undermined a constitution never very vigorous, and induced an attack of serious illness. His biographer relates, that about the end of November 1706 he went to visit his friend Mr Christie at Kinross, where "he was seized with a numbness in his legs, and an atrophy over his whole body." It was thought by his physicians that the attack would prove fatal; but by the aid of skilful advice, and the providence of God, he gradually recovered, though he never regained his former health. Being very delicate, he was ordered to try the "Bath" waters, which were at that time considered very salutary, and caused

[1] The letters of consecration, which were published by Bishop Russell in his edition of Keith's Catalogue of Scottish Bishops, p. 518, are replete with melancholy interest, as detailing the declining state of health in which the Bishops were at the time, when they took the important step which secured to Scotland the blessings of a valid ministry.

that city to be much frequented by the learned and fashionable of the day. Accordingly he repaired to Bath, and there and in London he remained for nearly a year. Though courting privacy, it was impossible to keep himself concealed. The fame of his writings had spread over England, and rendered their illustrious author an object of interest to the learned in that country. And besides this, there was a holier bond which ensured him an affectionate welcome from English Churchmen, and linked them to him—a bond independent of country and all the differences of society—even "the communion of saints." In Bishop Sage they recognised the Church to which he belonged, and for Christ's sake they cordially gave him the right hand of fellowship, and loaded him with kindness and attention. At this time, he became acquainted with many of those distinguished persons who, like himself, were suffering for their adherence to the exiled family; and the similarity of their circumstances, as a matter of course, drew them more closely together. They pressed him earnestly to remain longer among them, and to try the waters for another season. Not having derived any benefit from them, and feeling his health declining, he excused himself, saying, "that he wished to return to Scotland and die there." On his return, however, it seems to have pleased God to protract the period of his existence, and to renew his strength. If at this time he had been in comfortable circumstances, the disease under which he laboured might have been considerably retarded; but his hard circumstances very probably compelled him to enter upon certain literary labours, which were too severe for his feeble physical powers. It was now that he produced his life of "Gawin Douglas," and together with the learned Ruddiman, his intimate friend, published his "Introduction to Drummond of Hawthornden's History of the Five Jameses"—the last effort of this great man's mind. After this, he sank by a gradual decay of the body, but retained his senses, and possessed his soul in patience until the last. On the night before his death, when some kind friend was condoling with him upon his afflicted circumstances, he replied—"You need not be

troubled about me—I am as free from all uneasiness as yourself;" and then thanking God for his freedom from bodily pain, and for the peaceful composure of his mind, he expressed his consciousness that his end was rapidly approaching and very near. Thus this eminent man expired at Edinburgh on the 17th June 1711, in the sixtieth year of his age. His mortal remains were interred in the burying-ground attached to the Church of the Greyfriars, and the last offices of religion were performed over them by Bishop Rose, amid the tears of friendship, and the regrets of all Scottish Churchmen.[1]

[1] The following inscription was to have been put upon a monument to the memory of Bishop Sage, which his friends then proposed to erect, but which, for some cause unknown to us, was never accomplished :—

Hic reliquiæ conduntur
Venerabilis viri Joannis Sage,
Honestis potius quam opulentis parentibus nati,
Qui omnia sua incrementa sibi debuit,
Suisque moribus sibi fortunam finxit,
Vera virtute nobilis,
Sine opibus et fastuosis titulis clarus,
Absque pompa et arrogantia doctus,
Sine fuco et superstione pius,
Ecclesiæ Scoticanæ Presbyter meritissimus,
In civitate Glasguensi Pastor fidelissimus,
In academia Andreana S.S. theologiæ
Professor designatus :
Sed, proh dolor ! fatali temporum injuria
Ne hoc fungeretur munere prohibitus.
Ob mirum ingenii acumen et solertiam,
Eximium rerum peritiam et prudentiam,
Præstantem morum gravitatem et suavitatem,
Bonis omnibus carus.
Populum quamdiu licuit, assidue admonebat,
Saluberrimis consiliis adjuvabat,
Facundissimis concionibus instruebat,
Eique fulgentissimo pietatis exemplo prælucebat.
Literas Græcas optime callebat,
Tanta erat Latini sermonis suavitas
Ut nativus quidam lepor non adscitus videretur.
In historiis tam sacris quam profanis apprime versatus,
Sacrosancta principum jura constanter et strenuè
Difficilimis etiam temporibus, asseruit.

In Bishop Sage, the subject of this imperfect Memoir, we have an excellent specimen of a catholic Churchman—of one who pursued the *via media*; and, while he avoided the principles of ultra-Protestantism on the one hand, was not in danger of rushing into any of the peculiarities of the Church of Rome, on the other. Deeply versed in the sacred Scriptures, and admirably qualified by profound learning to interpret them, he did not of himself dogmatise on any point, nor oppose his mere opinion to those who questioned his assertions, but appealed to the unanimous consent of antiquity, and yielded to the decisions of the Church in all matters which she had defined. It is true, the religious controversy of his day was almost entirely limited to the *doctrine of the Church itself*, but the same rule which he applied to this, if occasion had required, would have been extended by him to the more mysterious subjects of the Creed. "Quod ubique, semper et ab omnibus," was his grand support, and gave him on all occasions the vantage ground over his enemies. Of his learning and acute reason-

Ecclesiam nutantem, et tantum non oppressam,
Ore, consilio, scriptis,
Tuebatur, sustinuit, suffulsit,
Apostolicum ecclesiæ regimen,
Per Episcopos, Presbyteros, et Diaconos,
Ex scriptis Cyprianicis,
Et reconditæ antiquitatis Monumentis,
Illustravit, propugnavit.
Schismata et hæreses repullulantes
Calamo suo erudito perstringebat,
Novatores et fanaticos hujus seculi circumcelliones
Contudit, Debellavit.
Ob præclara in Rempublicam et Ecclesiam merita,
Dignus, omnium æqui amantium judicio,
Qui non solum cathedrâ academicâ,
Sed et sacra cohonestaretur infulâ.
Tandem studiis et laboribus debilitatus,
Ærumnis et ægritudine Confectus,
Cum tot malis, Ecclesiæ, Patriæ, Sibique luctuosis
Diutius superesse non potuit,
Placide Obdormivit in Christo Venerandus Antistes,
Anno Ætatis 59,
Æræ Christianæ 1711.

ing powers, the Works[1] which he has left behind him are the best evidences. They display his profound skill in all the ancient languages—his thorough acquaintance with the writings of the Fathers of the Christian Church—and his complete knowledge of general history. These were the qualities which gave him an easy triumph over every antagonist with whom he was engaged.

If, in controversy, he may seem occasionally to write with bitterness, and to indulge in coarseness of language, this was the fault of the times in which he lived, and the consequence of the party spirit which ran so high. Probably had he used milder weapons, they would have failed to affect his opponents. They assailed the Church and her ministers with violence and harshness, and the multitude were impressed with the truth of their statements in proportion to their boldness, and vulgar manner of supporting them. While such was the character of his adversaries, and the method of their attacks, it was almost impossible to avoid meeting them on their own ground, and turning their own weapons against themselves. But even when Bishop Sage is most severe, there is such a manifest desire to arrive at truth, and the provocation of his anta-

[1] The Works of Bishop Sage are as follow :—"The Fundamental Charter ;" "The Cyprianic Age ;" "The Vindication of the Cyprianic Age ;" "An Account of the late Establishment of Presbytery by the Parliament of Scotland in 1690 ;" Some Remarks in a Letter from a Gentleman in the City to a Minister in the Country, on Mr David Williamson's Sermon before the General Assembly," Edinburgh, 1703 ; "A Brief Examination of some things in Mr Meldrum's Sermon preached on the 6th of May 1703, against a Toleration to those of the Episcopal Persuasion ;" "The Reasonableness of a Toleration of those of the Episcopal Persuasion inquired into purely on Church Principles," 1704 ; the "Life of Gawin Douglas," 1710 ; and an Introduction to the Works of Drummond of Hawthornden, to which publication his friend the learned Ruddiman lent his assistance. Bishop Sage also wrote the second and third Letters concerning the persecution of the Episcopal Clergy in Scotland, and left several unfinished MSS., one intended to have been a system of Divinity, in which the Church and the sacraments, as the channels of grace, were to have occupied their proper place ; another containing a review of the Westminster Confession—a Treatise on the Culdees—a History of the Commission of the General Assembly—together with one or two letters, which will appear in this collection of his Works.

gonist has been so glaringly presumptuous, that one forgets his asperity in following his argument, and feels that the object of his sarcasm meets with what he richly deserves. It must be remembered, also, that he does not write under any influence of personal revenge, but under a deep sense of the injustice which has been done to the sacred cause of religion. When his wrath waxes hot, it is not from any injury he himself has received, but because truth has been perverted, and sophistry and falsehood employed to deceive the minds of the unwary.

In private life, Bishop Sage was deservedly esteemed for the urbanity of his manners, for the pleasantness of his conversation, and for the meekness of his deportment. Unlike many men of learning and talent, who delight in exercising the strength of their intellect upon persons of inferior ability, and are petulant when contradicted, he delighted in encouraging those with whom he came in contact to give their opinions, was lenient towards the weak, and willing to think that he himself might be mistaken. Hence in every society he was a favourite, and had few personal enemies. Of his integrity of principle and genuine piety, it would be superfluous to speak. These qualities were never called in question even by his most virulent polemical opponents, and those who knew him intimately have borne testimony that he possessed them in no ordinary degree. Upon the whole, then, we may reckon him with the good and excellent of the earth —as a learned man, we may place him in the front rank of those illustrious sons which Scotland has produced—and as a Divine, he stands among the brightest of those mighty names which grace the seventeenth (as it has been called, that wonderful) century, and are the glory of the Anglo and Scoto-Catholic Churches.

EDITOR'S PREFACE.

THE Title of the present Volume requires some explanation. It is called the "Fundamental Charter of Presbytery," but lest it should be imagined that it relates to "Presbytery" *in general*, in contradistinction to *Episcopacy*, or rather Catholicity, we beg the Reader to turn to the Article in the Scottish "Claim of Right," which is the basis of our Author's argument. He will there see that it refers merely to Scotch Presbyterianism, as it was defined in that singular document, and that the whole enquiry contained in this Volume is confined to the peculiar form of schism which is established north of the Tweed.

It is to be observed also that this Treatise in some copies of the Work has another title-page, in which it is styled "Presbytery untwisted to the Bottom, &c." The book itself is in every respect the same, although published under another name. The change in the title-page was made by the Bookseller to serve his own purposes, without the knowledge of Bishop Sage. The "Fundamental Charter" was answered after its Author had gone to his rest, in a book entitled "A Countryman's Letter to a Curate," and this answer produced a "Vindication of Fundamental Charter,

&c." by "A True Son of the Afflicted Church of Scotland," supposed to have been Bishop Gillan, the biographer and friend of Sage.

The Editor, in his Memoir of the Author, has not described the nature of his several Works, and the particular circumstances which called forth the exercise of his learned pen, having reserved the performance of this task for a Preface to each Volume of his Works. The Editor is responsible for the *substance* of the notes throughout the Volume within brackets thus [E.], which have been revised by the Publishing Committee of the Spottiswoode Society. At page 153 in note 2—read "Lennox" for "Moray," —"*by order of the Regent Lennox.*"

Edinburgh, December 1844.

THE

PREFACE.

THIS Article which I have now examined, was no sooner established in our Scottish Claim of Right,[1] than I turned serious to satisfy myself about it. I thought it concerned me as a Scottish man to understand, as well as I could, that which made such a figure in the original contract between King and people. I thought I was no less concerned as a Christian to be resolved about its merits. I perceived it might readily affect my practice, and though I abhor, as heartily as any man, all breaking of the Church's peace for rattles or nutshells, yet I could not but reckon of it as a matter of conscience to me, to endeavour to be sure that I built neither my faith nor my obedience in a matter of such consequence, as I take the Government of the Church to be, on a deceitful bottom. Perhaps I was bound to be inquisitive by some other reduplications, not needful to be named.

I had not spent much application about it when I was satisfied, and thought I had ground to hope the wisdom of

[1] [This was the document in which the first Scottish Convention of Estates after the Revolution, in 1688, set forth their grievances, and assigned their reasons for having declared the Crown of Scotland vacant. It consisted of twenty-four articles or counts; and the one which has been well named by our author, "The Fundamental Charter of Presbytery," ranks as twenty-second, in this extraordinary catalogue of royal delinquency and national suffering. It is remarkable that this Article is the only one in the Claim of Right which refers to the Church, and that the sole ground of the "grievance" of Episcopacy was its "opposition to the inclinations of the Scottish people." It is hoped that the candid reader of this volume will take a very different view of a plain matter of fact, from that entertained by the framers of this famous document.—E.]

the nation, after more deliberate researches, might find it reasonable either to restore to the Church her ancient and just government, or settle the new one, on some (at least) more spacious basis, but I was disappointed. For

Three Sessions of Parliament are now over; and the Article is so far from being either retracted or corrected, that, on the contrary, it hath been still insisted on, and deemed sufficient to support very weighty superstructures. Each Session hath erected some new thing or other upon it.

This, with the importunity of some friends, at last determined me to enquire more fully and minutely into the value of the Article, and the Work hath swelled to such a bulk as you see.

I confess I cannot apologise sufficiently for my adventuring to expose such an ill composure to the public view, especially considering how nice and critical, if not piqued and humoursome, an age we live in.

I ever thought that much of the beauty as well as of the utility of books lay in good method and a distinct range of thoughts, and I cannot promise that I have observed that so punctually as clearer heads might have done.

I have less reason to be confident of the style. It is hard for most Scottish men to arrive at any tolerable degree of English purity. Our greatest caution cannot prevent the stealing of our own words and idioms into our pens, and their dropping thence into our writings. All things considered, I have as little reason to think I have guarded or could guard against them as any Scottish man. For not only have mine opportunities, all my life, been none of the best, but for finding materials for the following papers I was obliged to read so many books written in right broad *Scotch*, and take so many citations from them, that it is little to be wondered if my book abounds with *Scotticisms*. I thought myself bound to be faithful in my citations, and I can promise I have been that. I could not reason from the authority of these citations without using the terms and phrases which are in them. This, no doubt, makes the *Scotticisms* numerous, and I shall not deny that my familiar acquaintance with these books, together with the prejudices of education, custom, and constant converse in the plain Scottish dialect, may have occasioned many more.

Neither shall I be over confident, that, where I have adventured to reason any point, I have done it to every man's conviction. I may have been, as other men, apt to impose on myself, and think I have advanced just propositions and drawn fair consequences, when I have not done it. No doubt, most men have such a kindness for themselves as too commonly inclines them to applaud their own thoughts, and judge their own reasonings just and solid, when they are but coarse enough, and others may very easily discover where the mistake lies. Yet this I can say for myself, I have done what I could to guard against all such prejudice and partial bias.

Sensible of these infirmities, I entreat the reader's favourable and benign censures. This I can tell him ingenuously, if I could have done better, I should not have grudged him the pleasure of it.

But perchance that which I am more concerned to account for is, what assistances I had for what I have advanced in the following sheets. And here I must confess I had not all the advantages I could have wished. Such are my present circumstances, that I could not rationally propose to myself to have access to the Public Records either of Church or State, and no doubt in this I was at a considerable loss; for he who transcribes from authentic Public Records doth it more securely than he who has things only from second hands.

Yet I do not think this disadvantage was such as should have entirely discouraged me from the attempt I have made. For some of my authors had access to the Public Registers, and I am apt to believe there was not much to be found there, relating to the controversies I have managed, which they have not published; so that, though it is possible I might have been *better*, yet I cannot think I was *ill* provided of helps. I cannot think any of my Presbyterian brethren can be provided *much better*.

The principal authors from which I have collected my materials are these:—Buchanan's History, published at Frankfort, anno 1594; Lesley's History, at Edinburgh, 1675; King James the Sixth's Works, in English, at London, 1616; Archbishop Spottswood's History of the Reformation of the Church of Scotland, at London, anno 1665; his Refutatio Libelli, &c. London, anno 1620; the True History of

the Church of Scotland, &c. said to be written by Mr David Calderwood, published anno 1678. Mr Petrie's History of the Catholic Church, &c. Tom. ii. printed at the Hague, anno 1662. Sir James Melville's Memoirs. The Old Scottish Liturgy. The Lord Herbert's History of the Life of King Henry VIII. Doctor Heylin and Dr Burnet's Histories of the Reformation of the Church of England. Calvin's Epistles, printed at Geneva anno 1617. Beza's Epistles till the year 1573. Acts and Monuments by Fox, &c.

I have likewise considered our printed Acts of Parliaments, the printed Acts of the General Assemblies from the year 1638, and as many pamphlets as I could find relating to the matters on which I insist. It is needless to name them here. You may find them named as occasion required in my book. There are two books which I must insist on a little.

One is a manuscript copy of the Acts of our Scottish Assemblies from the year 1560 till the year 1616. Our Presbyterian brethren may be ready to reject its authority, if it militate against them. I give my reader, therefore, this brief account of it.

It was transcribed in the year 1638, when the *National Covenant* was in a flourishing state; for I find at the end of it the transcriber's name and designation written with the same hand by which the whole MS. is written; and he says—"He began to transcribe upon the 15th day of January 1638, and compleated his work on the 23d of April that same year." He was such a reader[1] as we have commonly in Scotland in country parishes.

It is not to be imagined it was transcribed then for serving the interests of Episcopacy; for, as Petrie and the Presbyterians generally affirm, the Prelates and Prelatists dreaded nothing more in those days than that the old Registers of the Kirk should come abroad; and it was about that time

[1] [The office of Reader was appointed by the First Book of Discipline, in order to supply parishes unprovided with ministers with persons competent to read the Common Prayers and Scriptures. This office was continued even after the present Establishment of Presbyterianism in Scotland—and a recent writer mentions an instance of its existence in the beginning of the nineteenth century. At that late period it was performed by the parish schoolmaster, who read chapters from the Bible before the minister entered the pulpit. It is now quite abolished. See the "Fundamental Charter of Presbytery." "Fifth Enquiry."—E.]

that Mr Petrie got his copy, from which he published so many Acts of our old General Assemblies. Nor is it to be doubted but that, as several copies then were, so particularly that which I have perused was transcribed for the ends of the *good old cause*. This I am sure of—the *Covenant*, as required then to be subscribed by the *Green Tables*,[1] is set down at full length in the manuscript. Besides,

The style and language testify that there is no reason to doubt that the Acts of Assemblies which it contains have been transcribed, word for word at first, from the authentic records. And if Calderwood's or Petrie's accounts of these Acts deserve any credit, my MS. cannot be rejected; for it hath all they have published, and for the most part in the same terms, except where these authors have altered the language, sometimes to make it more fashionable and

[1] [This was the epithet applied to the body of disaffected subjects who resisted the royal authority in reference to the Liturgy and Canons in 1638, and in order to overawe the Government of Charles I., formed themselves into a so-called council, which sat in Edinburgh. The name was derived from the manner in which their deliberations were carried on, viz.—at four separate tables, in four different rooms—one of which was for the nobles, another for the gentry, a third for the preachers, and a fourth for the burgesses. The deliberations of those bodies were finally revised by a fifth or *general table*, composed of a delegate from each of the other four. The first fruit which this illegal, and (as it has been well characterized by the Presbyterian biographer of the noted Alexander Henderson) "despotic" tribunal produced, was the "National Covenant or Band," which was the germ of the subsequent rebellion. Its framers adopted the Negative Confession of Faith subscribed by King James and his household in 1581, which was a violent protest against Popery, and ignorantly applied all its negations to the Liturgy and Canons of 1638, thus frightening themselves with a bugbear purely of their own invention. With reference to the name applied to this self-constituted body, a singular debate occurred just as the King's Commissioner was quitting the Glasgow Assembly. The Earl of Rothes said—"When the commissioners from Shires and Presbyteries met and sat down, what absurdity was there to call them so met a *Table*, seeing it is called a *Council Table*, or a *Judicial Table*, such as Prelates call their *Tables?* If we called it a Judicial Table, let us be hanged for it. A *tailor's table*, sitting with his men sewing upon it, is called a *table*, or a company eating at such a man's table; there is no absurdity in the speech, and we did not call ourselves the *Tables*, but others gave us that name." "I except not so much," said the Marquis of Hamilton, "against the name of *Table*. I have no cause of passion to hear their meetings called a *Table*, for there is passion enough at my heart that I find so much power at these *Tables*, and so little at the Council Table, for it is well known your positive councils are more regarded than the King's Council Table."—E.]

intelligible, sometimes to serve their cause and the concerns of their party.

It hath chasms also, and defects, where, they say, leaves have been torn from the original Registers, and I have not adduced many Acts from it which either one or both these authors have not likewise mentioned in their Histories.

Calderwood has indeed concealed very many, having intended, it seems, to publish nothing but what made for him, though I think even in that his *judgement* hath not sufficiently kept pace with his *inclinations*. Nay, his Supplement, which he hath subjoined to his History, as well as the History itself, is lame by his own acknowledgment. For these are the very first words of it—" I have in the preceding History only inserted such Acts, articles, and answers to questions, as belonged to the scope of the History and form of Church government, some few excepted, touching corruptions in the worship of God, or the office and calling of ministers. But because there are other Acts and articles necessary to be known, I have SELECTED such as are of greatest use, passing by such as were TEMPORARY, or concerned only TEMPORARY OFFICES," &c.

Here is a clear confession that he has not given us all the Acts of Assemblies. Nay, that he has not given *all such as concerned temporary offices;* and amongst these we shall find him in the following sheets more confidently, than warrantably, reckoning *Superintendency* and the *Episcopacy* which was agreed to at Leith, anno 1572.

I have mentioned these things, that the world may see it cannot be reasonable for our Presbyterian brethren to insist on either Calderwood's authority or ingenuity against my MSS. How ingenuous or impartial he has been you may have opportunity to guess, before you have got through the ensuing papers.

Petrie hath indeed given us a great many more of the Acts of General Assemblies than Calderwood hath done, as may appear to any who attends to the margin of my book; but he also had the *good cause* to serve, and therefore has corrupted some things, and concealed other things, as I have made appear; however, he has the far greater part of what I have transcribed from the MSS.

Spotswood hath fewer than either of the two Presby-

terian historians, yet some he hath which I find also in the MS., and which they have both omitted. In short,

I have taken but very few from it which are not to be found in some one or more of these Historians, neither have I adduced so much as one from it, nor is one in it which is not highly agreeable to the state and circumstances of the Church and the genius of the times, for which it mentions them; so that,

Upon the whole matter, I see no reason to doubt of its being a faithful transcript;[1] and I think I may justly say of it as Optatus said of another MS. upon the like occasion—*Vetustas Membranarum testimonium perhibet*, &c. (Optat. Milev. lib. i, f. 7. edit. Paris 1569). It hath all the marks of antiquity and integrity that it pretends to, and there is nothing about it that renders it suspicious.

The other book, which I said required some farther consideration, is the History of the Reformation of the Church of Scotland, containing Five Books, &c. commonly attributed to John Knox by our Presbyterian brethren. That which I have to say about it is chiefly that Mr Knox was not the author of it.

Archbishop Spottiswoode hath proven this by demonstration in his History, page 267. His demonstration is—"That the author, whoever he was, talking of one of our martyrs, remitteth the reader for a farther declaration of his sufferings to the 'Acts and Monuments' of Mr Fox, which came not to light till some twelve years after Knox's death." Mr Patrick Hamilton was the martyr, and the

[1] [This manuscript, to which the learned author refers, extended to three volumes, and was called the "Booke of the Universal Kirk of Scotland." It was produced at the Glasgow Assembly in 1638, and after passing through various hands, came into the possession of Bishop Archibald Campbell, who carried it with him to London, and deposited it in the Library of Sion College. The Kirk made frequent attempts to have it restored to their custody, and even went so far as to petition Parliament for that purpose. A committee of the House of Commons was appointed in 1834 to inquire into the matter, the Sub-Librarian of Sion College was ordered to produce the books, and persons from Scotland were summoned to prove their authenticity. It is more than probable that the Presbyterians would have succeeded in their endeavours to recover them, but the great fire, which destroyed both Houses of Parliament, occurred about the time, and these interesting relics and records of Scottish ecclesiastical excitement perished in the flames.—E.]

reference is to be seen, page 4 of that History, I am now considering. Besides this I have observed a great many more infallible proofs that Knox was not the author. I shall only instance in some three or four. Thus—

Page 447. The author, having set down a copy of the letter sent by the Church of Scotland to the Church of England (of which more by and by)—" Tells how the English Non-Conformists wrote to Beza, and Beza to Grindal, Bishop of London; which letter of Beza's to Grindal, he says, is the *eight* in order amongst Beza's Epistles; and in that same page he mentions another of Beza's letters to Grindal, calling it the *twelfth* in number." Now, it is certain Beza's Epistles were not published till the year 1573, i. e. after Knox's death.

It may be observed also, that he adds farther in that same page, that " the sincerer sort of the ministry in England had not yet assaulted the jurisdiction and Church government, (which they did not till the year 1572, at which time they published their First and Second Admonitions to the Parliament), but only had excepted against superstitious apparel, and some other faults in the Service-Book. From which, besides that it is evident Knox could not be the author, we may learn from the author's confession, whoever he was, that the controversies about *Parity* and *Imparity*, &c. were not so early in Britain as our Presbyterian brethren are earnest to have the present generation believe. Again,

Page 449. The author, narrating how Henry, Queen Mary's husband, &c. was buried, adds, in confirmation of his own veracity, thus—" If there had been any solemn burial, Buchanan had wanted wit to relate otherwise, seeing there would have been so many witnesses to testify the contrary, therefore the contriver of the late History of Queen Mary wanted policy here to convey a lie." Thus, I say, the author vouches Buchanan's authority, and it must be Buchanan's History that he refers to, for there is not a syllable about Henry's burial to be found in any of his other writings. Now

Not to insist on the incredibleness of Knox's running for shelter to Buchanan's authority concerning a matter of fact so remarkable in itself, and which happened in his own time, in that very city in which he lived, and was minister; not to insist on this, I say, Buchanan himself in his Dedica-

tion of his History to King James VI. clearly decides the matter.

He tells his Majesty there were two considerations which chiefly put him upon writing his History. First—"He perceived his Majesty had read and understood the Histories of almost all other nations, and it was incongruous and unaccountable that he who was so well acquainted with foreign affairs should be a stranger to the history of his own kingdom. Secondly, he was intrusted with the King's education. He could not attend his Majesty in that important office by reason of his old age and multiplying infirmities; he applied himself, therefore, to write his History, thereby to compense the defects of his non-attendance," &c.

And from both reasons it is evident that Knox was dead before Buchanan applied himself to the writing of his History, for Knox died anno 1572, King James was then but six years of age, and is it credible that at that age he had read and got by heart the histories of almost all other nations? Indeed Buchanan survived Knox by ten years, and for a good many of them was able to wait, and actually waited on the King, so that it is clear it was towards the end of his days, and after Knox's death, that he applied himself to his History; and it is very well known it was never published till the year 1582. But this is not all.

The author of that which is called Knox's History, adduces Buchanan's authority for convelling the credit of the contriver of the late History of Queen Mary, which was written, I cannot tell how long after Buchanan was dead, as well as Knox. Further,

Page 306. The author discourses thus—"The Books of Discipline have been of late so often published, that we shall forbear to print them at this time." Now, there were never more than two Books of Discipline, and the Second was not so much as projected till the year 1576, i. e. four years after Knox had departed this life. Once more,

Page 286. We read thus—"Some in France, after the sudden death of Francis the Second, and calling to mind the death of Charles the Ninth in blood, and the slaughter of Henry the Second, did remark the tragical ends of these three Princes who had persecuted God's servants so cruelly. —And, indeed, the following Kings of France, unto this

day, have found this true, by their unfortunate and unexpected ends." Now,

Charles the Ninth died not till the 30th of May anno 1574, i. e. eighteen months after Knox. The following Kings of France, who made the *unfortunate* and *unexpected ends*, were Henry the Third and Henry the Fourth. Henry the Third was not murdered till the year 1589, Henry the Fourth not till May 1610—the former seventeen, the latter thirty-eight years, after the death of Knox.

From this taste it is clear, that that History, at least as we now have it, was not written by Knox. All that can be said with any shadow of probability is, that Knox provided some materials for it. But granting this, how shall we be able to separate that which is *spurious* in it from that which is *genuine?* All I can say is this—

It is plain to every one that reads it that he has been a thorough-paced Presbyterian who framed it as we have it; by consequence its authority is stark nought for anything in it that favours *Presbytery* or bespatters *Prelacy;* and if it ought to have any credit at all, it is only where the controversies about Church government are no ways interested, or where it mentions anything that may be improven to the advantages of *Episcopacy*, just as the testimonies of adversaries are useful for the interests of the opposite party, and not an ace farther; so that I had reason, (if any man can have it) to insist on its authority, as I have frequently done, but no Presbyterian can in equity either plead, or be allowed the same privilege.

I could give the reader a surfeit of instances, which cannot but appear to any considering person to be plain and notorious Presbyterian corruptions in it, but I shall only represent *one*, as being of considerable importance in the controversy which I have managed in my Second Enquiry; and by that the reader may make a judgment of the author's candour and integrity in other things.

The English Non-Conformists, zealous to be rid of the vestments, and some other forms and ceremonies retained by the Church of England, which they reckoned to be scandalous impositions, wrote earnestly (as is known) to several Reformed Churches and Protestant Divines, beseeching them to interpose with the Church of England for an

case of these burdens. It seems they wrote to some in Scotland also, probably to Mr Knox. He was of their acquaintance, and they could not but be secure enough of his inclinations, considering how warm he had been about these matters at Frankfort.[1]

However it was, the Church of Scotland did actually interpose. The General Assembly met at Edinburgh, December 27, anno 1566, ordered John Knox to draw a letter to the English Clergy in favour of those Non-Conformists. This letter was subscribed and sent. Now, consider the tricks of the author of the History attributed to Knox.

The inscription of the letter as it is in Spotswoode, Petrie, and the manuscript copy of the Acts of the General Assembly, is this—"The Superintendents, Ministers, and Commissioners of the Church within the Realme of Scotland, to their Brethren the Bishops and Pastors of England who have renounced the Roman Antichrist, and do profess with them the Lord Jesus in sincerity, with the increase of the Holy Spirit."

Thus, I say, Spotswood hath it (page 198), and the MS. and Petrie (tom. ii. p. 348) have it in the same words, only where Spotswood hath "wish," they have "desire," which makes no material difference. But the spurious Knox has it thus (page 445)—"The Superintendents, with other Ministers and Commissioners of the Church of God in the Kingdom of Scotland, to their Brethren the Bishops and Pastors of God's Church in England, who profess with us in Scotland the truth of Jesus Christ."

Now, consider if there are not material differences between these two inscriptions. By the inscription, as it is in Spotswood, Petrie, and the MS. the dignity and superiority of the Scottish Superintendents above the rest of the clergy are clearly preserved. By the other account it is sadly obscured, and they are made (at least very much) to stand on a level with other ministers, &c.

By the inscription as in Spotswood, &c. the sentiments our Scottish clergy had then about the English Reformation and Constitution are very plain, genuine, and charitable. They were satisfied that the Bishops and Pastors of the Church of England had renounced the Roman Antichrist,

[1] [See Collier's Ecclesiastical History, London, 8vo. 1841, vol. vi. p. 144-152.– E.]

and that they professed the Lord Jesus in SINCERITY; and they had for them suitably the Christian and brotherly charity which the orthodox and sincere Christians of one Church ought to have for the orthodox and sincere Christians of another Church. They *wished* or *desired* to them the *increase of the Holy Spirit*. How highly this was agreeable to the sentiments of the then Protestants in Scotland I have made fully appear in the discussion of my Second Enquiry. But,

To the pseudo Knox, it seems, it looked highly scandalous to own that the Bishops and Pastors of England had *renounced the Roman Antichrist*, or that they professed the Lord Jesus *in sincerity*. How could these things be said so long as they retained *Antichrist's hierarchy*, or had so many *Romish mixtures?* And, therefore, to *wish* them the *increase of the Holy Spirit* was too bold a prayer; it was founded on a false hypothesis; it supposed they had the Holy Spirit already. How suitable is all this to the Presbyterian temper and principles? And, by consequence, is it not evident that these alterations were not the effects of negligence or inadvertency, but of the true spirit of the party? But this is not all.

In the body of the letter, as recorded by the pseudo Knox, there are several corruptions. I shall only point at one, but it is a considerable one.

The General Assembly which sent the letter, after a digression concerning the care that ought to be had of tender consciences, &c. resume their main purpose thus—"We return to our former humble supplication, which is, that our brethren who amongst you refuse these *Romish rags* may find of you, who are the PRELATS, such favour as our Head and Master commandeth every one of his members to shew to another."

So it is not only in the MS., Spotswood, and Petrie, word for word, but also in a virulent Presbyterian pamphlet called "Scotidromus, directed to all noble Scots and kind Catholics zealous for the Romish Religion," written anno 1638, to cast dirt at that time upon Episcopacy, and render it odious to the people; which pamphlet I have by me in manuscript. But

The suppositious Knox has it thus—"Now again we

return to our former request, which is, that the brethren among you who refuse the Romish rags may find of you (not the PRELATES, but) who USE and URGE them, such favour, &c." How unfit was it for the world to know that a Scottish General Assembly had owned the Bishops of England as PRELATES? It was scandalous, no doubt, to the godly. It was expedient, therefore, to falsify a little, and foist in more useful epithets; to call them, not PRELATES, but USERS and URGERS of the Ceremonies.

I have insisted the longer on this Book, because our Presbyterian brethren are so earnest to have the world believe that it was written by Knox; particularly G[ilbert] R[ule],[1] in his First Vindication, &c. (in answer to Question 1, § 8), where, too, observe, by the way, how extravagantly that author blunders. His words are—"Anno 1559. The Protestant ministers and people held a General Assembly at St Johnstown,[2] saith Knox, Hist. Lib. ii. p. 137." Now there is not so much as one syllable of a General Assembly in the text. Upon the margin, indeed, there are these words—"The first Assembly at St Johnstown;" but no Presbyterian, I think (unless he is one of G. R.'s kind), will be so impudent as to say that all that is on the margin of that book was written by Knox; and that meeting which was then at Perth was nothing like that Court which we call a General Assembly. But enough of this.

To conclude: Though I am firmly persuaded that Knox was not the author of this History,[3] yet because it passes

[1] [Gilbert Rule, Principal of the University of Edinburgh, and the vindicator of the Kirk in several scurrilous and ignorant pamphlets, one of which is here quoted, and was written in answer to "Ten Questions" put forth by some Churchman..—E.] [2] [Perth.—E.]

[3] [This conclusion is incorrect. For the petition of Knox's secretary and amanuensis, Richard Bannatyne, to the General Assembly held in Edinburgh March 1572, places the genuineness of at least *Four Books* of the History beyond doubt. Speaking of his master, he says—"Where it is not unknown to your wisdoms that he left to the Kirk and Town of Edinburgh his History, containing in effect the beginning and progress of Christ's true religion now of God's great mercy established in this realme, wherein he hath continued and *perfectly ended at the year of God* 1564," (the date of the end of the Fourth Book), "so that of things done sensyne nothing be him is putt in that form and order as he hath done the former; yet nottheless, there are certain scrolls, papers, and minutes of things, left to me be him to use at my pleasure, whereof a part were written and subscrived with his own hand, and another be mine at his command, which, if they

commonly under his name, I have still cited it so on my margin. The edition I have used is that in 4to, published at Edinburgh, anno 1644.

were collected and gathered together, would make sufficient declaration of the principal things that have occurred since the ending of his former History." Then Bannatyne proceeds to state that these scrolls and detached papers were in a very disordered state, and that the placing them in proper order would cost more time and money than he could be expected to spend without remuneration, and begs the Assembly, that in order to preserve these precious relics of his worthy master, they would make some provision to him for that purpose. The result of his petition was a grant of L.40, "and a request to the Kirk of Edinburgh to appoint some learnit men to support Richard Bannatyne to put John Knox's History, that now is in scrolls and papers, in good forme."—(Booke of the Universall Kirk of Scotland, printed for the BANNATYNE CLUB, p. 259-60). It is clear from this that Knox wrote Four Books of the History, which he bequeathed to the Kirk and Town of Edinburgh, and that he left behind him materials for a continuation of it, which were put in their present form by Bannatyne and his "learnit" co-editors. The argument of our author in regard to the History is sound in all respects, and would be irresistible, if the passages, on which it is based, were not interpolations by a later hand. But the truth is, he was misled by an unfaithful edition of this work published at Edinburgh, 1644, by one David Buchanan, in which are several additions (among others those quoted by our author) which are not to be found in the earlier editions of the work. This Mr David Buchanan published two editions of Knox—a quarto, Edinburgh, 1644—a folio, London, in the same year—both of which are interpolated, but in different degrees. For instance, the passages quoted by Bishop Sage from pp. 447-449, are to be found in the Edinburgh edition, but do not occur in the London folio; and again, the quotation at page 36 of the Fundamental Charter is omitted in the same edition, but inserted in the Edinburgh 4to. The other passages, however, here quoted, are found in both editions, at the pages referred to in the quarto, and at pp. 301 instead of 306, 281 instead of 286, in the London folio of 1644. But none of the above quotations are to be found in any genuine edition of Knox's Works. They are not printed in the early octavo edition of 1586, and do not occur in an old MS. in possession of David Laing, Esq., the learned Keeper of the Signet Library, by whom, through the kindness of a mutual friend, they have been collated with it. (The Editor understands that Mr Laing is now engaged in preparing a new and faithful edition of Knox for the press, a desideratum which has long been felt by the student of Scottish Ecclesiastical History, who must rejoice that the work of supplying the defect has fallen to one so eminently qualified by attainments and opportunities to execute it aright). It reflects no little discredit on those who knowingly permitted the spurious work of David Buchanan to pass current as the genuine production of Knox, and detracts greatly from the merits of a cause which required to be supported by such disingenuous subterfuges. The argument of our author, however, is by no means impaired by the mistake into which he has fallen, for the work having been interpolated by dishonest persons to further the Presbyterian

The other treatises attributed to Knox, and I know no reason to doubt their being his, from which I have cited any thing, are in an Appendix to the History.

I have not made it my work to cite Acts of Parliament, and represent the favourable countenance Episcopacy hath had from the State, so much as to consider the sentiments of our Reformers, and those who succeeded them in their ecclesiastical capacity, partly because the Acts of Parliament have been diligently collected before, particularly, whoso pleases may see a goodly train of them from the year 1560 till the year 1617 in the Large Declaration, page 333, &c.; partly because our Presbyterian brethren are in use to insist more on the Books of Discipline and the Acts of General Assemblies, &c. than on Acts of Parliaments.

One advantage, amongst many disadvantages, I think I have: It is, that the authors I have most frequently cited were Presbyterians—by consequence authors whose testimonies can least be called in question by my Presbyterian brethren.

I do not pretend to have exhausted the subjects I have insisted on. Any reader may easily perceive I have been at a loss as to several things in history. Perchance I have sometimes started things *new*, and which have not been observed before. I wish I may have given occasion to those who are fitter and better furnished with helps for such enquiries, to consider if they can bring more light to our history. In the meantime, I think I have said enough to convince the reader that our Presbyterian brethren have not

cause, any thing in support of his argument, which the author extracts from it is of course armed with double force against his opponents. It becomes the unwilling testimony of an unscrupulous enemy. As to the judicious Spottiswoode, whose authority our author quotes, p. 13, in support of his opinion, the Archbishop was evidently in error when he said that Foxe's Martyrology was not in existence until twelve years after Knox's death, for we find this book quoted and referred to by several authors before that event occurred. (Gillan's Life of Sage, page 20). The only way of accounting for the Primate's mistake, is by supposing that the earliest edition of Foxe, with which he was familiar, was printed subsequently to the times of the Scottish Reformers—a mistake which might very readily occur in those days, when communication between literary men and learned persons at a distance was not so easy as at present.—E.]

reason to be so confident as commonly they are, for their side of the controversies I have managed.

Yet, after all this, I am not secure but that they will endeavour to have my book answered, for all books must be answered that militate against them; and they can still find some G[ilbert] R[ule] or other who has zeal and confidence enough for such attempts.

Upon the supposition, therefore, that I must have an answer, I do for once become an earnest suiter to my Presbyterian brethren that they would employ some person of ordinary sense and discretion to answer me, and not the common *Vindicator* of their Kirk, G[ilbert] R[ule], for I have got enough of him, and I incline not to have any more meddling with him.

Whoso reads the following papers I think may find such a sample of him, such a *swatch* (pardon the word if it is not English) of both his *historical* and his *argumentative skill*, a talent which he bewails much the want of in his adversaries, as may make it appear just and reasonable for any man to decline him; but lest he is not represented there so fully as he ought to be, so fully as to justify my declining of him, I shall be at some farther pains here to give the reader a fuller prospect of him.

To delineate him minutely might perchance be too laborious for me, and too tedious and loathsome to my reader. I shall restrict myself, therefore, to his four *cardinal virtues*, his *learning*, his *judgment*, his *civility*, and his *modesty*. Or, because we are Scottish men, to give them their plain Scotch names, his *ignorance*, his *nonsense*,[1] his *ill-nature*, and his *impudence*.

[1] [In reading these severe terms, we cannot help feeling deep regret that our author should have indulged in them. But we must remember that in those days of party spirit, theological warfare was generally carried on in this rough way, and in this particular instance Bishop Sage was provoked by the person with whom he was contending, who had published pamphlets teeming with malevolence and ignorance, and who, though often admonished and refuted, still persisted in his endeavours to damage the claims and character of the Church. Such a person could only be silenced by some strenuous effort to bring the blush into his face, and to weaken his influence with the credulous multitude, and the Bishop adopted the only method by which these ends could have been accomplished. He painted his opponent in his true colours. Indeed, our

Perhaps I shall not be able to reduce every individual instance to its proper species. It is very hard to do that in matters which have such affinity one with another as there is between *ignorance* and *nonsense*, or between *ill-nature* and *impudence*. But this I dare promise, if I cannot keep by the nice laws of categories, I shall be careful to keep by the strict laws of justice. I shall entitle him to nothing that is not truly his own. So much for preface; come we next to the purpose.

And in the first place, I am apt to think, since ever writing was a trade, there was never author furnished with a richer stock of unquestionable *ignorance* for it. To insist on all the evidences of this would swell this Preface to a bulk beyond the book.

I omit, therefore, his making *Presbyterian ruling elders*, as contradistinct from *teaching elders*, of Divine institution; his making the SENIORES sometimes mentioned by the Fathers such ruling elders; and his laying stress on the old blunder about St Ambrose's testimony to that purpose. (Vide True Representation of Presbyterian Government, Prop. 3.) These I omit, because not peculiar to him.

I omit even that, which for any thing I know may be peculiar to him, viz. that his *ruling elders* are called *Bishops*, and that their necessary qualifications are set down at length in Scripture, *e. g.* 1 Tim. iii. 2, and Tit. i. 6. (Ibid. Prop. iii. 4).

I omit his learned affirmative, that—"Patronages were not brought into the Church till the seventh or eighth century, or later; and that they came in amongst the latest antichristian corruptions and usurpations" (Ibid. Answer to Objection 9).

I omit all such assertions as these—"That the most and most eminent of the Prelatists acknowledged that by our Saviour's appointment, and according to the practice of the first and best ages of the Church, she ought to be and was governed in common by ministers acting in parity" (Ibid.

author seems to have been conscious of the severity of his tone towards his antagonist, for we find him apologizing for it in the body of the Work —"I have treated him thus coarsely, because I know no other way authors deserve who will needs speak *nonsense*, rather than speak nothing."—E.]

Prop. 12); that "Diocesan Episcopacy was not settled in St Cyprian's time" (Rational Defence of Nonconformity, &c. p. 157); that "Diocesan Episcopacy prevailed not for the first three centuries, and that it was not generally in the fourth century" (Ibid. 158); that "the Bishop St Cyprian all alongst speaks of was a *Presbyterian Moderator*" (Ibid. 197); that "Cyprian, Austine, Athanasius, &c. were only such *Moderators*" (Ibid. 175, 176, 177, 178).

I omit his insisting on the authority of the Decretal Epistles attributed to Pope Anacletus, as if they were genuine (Ibid. 202), and that great evidence of his skill in the affairs of the Protestant Churches, viz. "that Episcopacy is not to be seen in any one of them except England" (Ibid. p. 10). Nay,

I omit his nimble and learned gloss he has put on St Jerome's *Toto Orbe Decretum*, &c. viz. "That this remedy of schism in many places began then (i. e. in St Jerome's time) to be thought on, and that it was no wonder that this corruption began then to creep in, it being then about the end of the fourth century when Jerome wrote," &c. (Ibid. 170).

Neither shall I insist on his famous exposition of St Jerome's *Quid facit Episcopus*, &c. because it has been sufficiently exposed already in the "Historical Relation of the General Assembly 1690," nor on his making Plutarch, Simonides, Chrysostom, &c. Every Grecian spoke Latin when he had the confidence to cite them. These and fifty more such surprizing arguments of our author's singular learning I shall pass over, and shall insist only a little on two or three instances, which, to my taste, seem superlatively pleasant.

And, 1. In that profound book which he calls "A Rational Defence of Nonconformity," &c. in answer to Dr Stillingfleet's "Unreasonableness of the Separation from the Church of England" (page 172), he hath glossed St Chrysostom yet more ridiculously than he did St Jerome. The passage, as it is in Chrysostom, is sufficiently famous, and known to all who have inquired into antiquity about the government of the Church. The learned Father having discoursed concerning the office and duties of a Bishop (Homily 10 on 1 Tim. iii.), and proceeding by the Apostle's method to discourse next of Deacons (Homily 11), started this difficulty, How came the Apostle to prescribe no rules about Presbyters? And he solved it thus—"Ὅτι οὐ πολὺ τὸ μέσον αὐτῶν καὶ

τῶν Ἐπισκόπων. Καὶ γὰρ καὶ αὐτοὶ διδασκαλίαν ἐισίν ἀναδεδεγμενοι καὶ προστασίαν τῆς Ἐκκλησίας καὶ ἃ περὶ ἐπισκόπων εἶπε, ταῦτα καὶ πρεσβυτέροις ἁρμόττει. Τῇ γὰρ χειροτονίᾳ μονῃ ὑπερβεβήκασι. Καὶ τοῦτῳ μόνον δοκοῦσι πλεονεκτεῖν τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους. "St Paul," says he, "did not insist about Presbyters, because there is no great difference between them and Bishops. Presbyters, as well as Bishops, have received power to teach and govern the Church. And the rules he gave to Bishops are also proper for Presbyters; for Bishops excel Presbyters only by the power of ordination, and by this alone they are reckoned to have more power than Presbyters." Vide edit. Savil. tom. iv. p. 289.

Now, it is plain to the most ordinary attention, that in the holy Father's dialect, χειροτονία signifies the power of conferring orders, just as διδασκαλία and προστασια signify the powers of teaching and governing. Consider now the *critical skill* of G[ilbert] R[ule].

Bellarmine had adduced this testimony, it seems, to shew that there was a disparity in point of power between Bishops and Presbyters, and had put it in Latin, thus—"Inter Episcopum atque Presbyterum interest fere nihil, quippe et Presbyteris Ecclesiæ cura permissa est. Et quæ de Episcopis dicuntur,[1] ea etiam Presbyteris congruunt; sola quippe Ordinatione superiores illi sunt." So G[ilbert] R[ule] has it. I know not if he has transcribed it faithfully. It is not his custom to do so, nor have I Bellarmine at hand to compare them. Sure I am the *translation* doth not fully answer the *original*. But however that is, go we forward with our learned author. These are his words:—

"What he (Bellarmine) allegeth out of this citation, that a Bishop may ordain, not a Presbyter, the learned Father's expression will not bear. For ordination must signify either the ordination the Bishop and Presbyter have, whereby they are put in their office, to be different, which he doth not allege; or that the difference between them was only in order or precedency, not in power or authority; or that it was by the ordination or appointment of the Church, not Christ's institution; but it can never signify the power of ordaining." Are not these pretty pleasant criticisms on χειροτονία? But the best follows. He gives a

[1] [*Dicit* in original, Bellarm. De Controv. vol. ii. p. 229.—E.]

demonstration that *ordination*, as mentioned by Chrysostom, can never signify the *power of ordaining*, for then, says he, Chrysostom (who was sufficiently a master of words) would have said—(mark it, beloved, he would have spoken Latin, and said) *Potestate Ordinandi*, not *Ordinatione*. And have we not our author now a *deep learned glossator?* I cannot promise a better instance of his critical skill, but I hope the next shall not be much worse.

2. Then in that same Rational Defence, &c. p. 199, sect. 4, he undertakes to prove the Divine institution of popular elections of ministers. His first argument he takes from Acts xiv. 23. The word χειροτονήσαντες must needs do it. Now, it is none of my present task to prove that that word cannot do it. Whosoever has considered how it is used in the New Testament may soon perceive that; and if our author had but read the book called *Jus Divinum Ministerii Evangelii*, written by a Provincial Assembly of his own friends, he might have seen that even *they* were confident it could not do it; nay, he himself, in that same fourth section, acknowledges it cannot do it. "I deny not," says he, "that this word is sometimes used figuratively for potestative mission, the effect or consequent of election, and that by one person, without suffrages, as Acts x. 41." And I think, after this, it was pleasant enough to make it do it for all that. But, as I said, it is none of my present business to debate the force of the word with him. All I am concerned for is to represent his superfine *skill* in *critical* learning. For he tells us gravely—"The word is most commonly used in his sense," viz. as it signifies "*to choose by suffrages*." And he proves it; but how? These two ways—"1. Of all the instances that Scapula in his Lexicon giveth of the use of the word, not one of them is to the contrary." Twenty *desperate* significations, you see, would have imported nothing; and who can doubt but Scapula's Lexicon is an uncontroverted standard for the ecclesiastical signification of words? But our author proceeds—"2. It cannot be instanced that ever the word is used for laying on of hands: Lifting up and laying them down being so opposite, it is not to be imagined that the one should be put for the other." And what needed more after this? Yet, lest this was not profound enough, our author plunges deeper. He will needs have

both the suffrages of the people and the imposition of the Apostles' hands to be signified by the word χειροτονήσαντες in that same text, Acts xiv. 23. "The Apostles appointed by ordination elders for the people, upon their electing them by suffrages." And then, in the close of the section—"I conclude, this being done κατα ἐκκλησίαν, in every Church, the people respective choosing their pastors, and the Apostles ordaining them, it is clear to have been generally the practice of these times, and so the institution of Christ."

I told, when I began with him, there might be instances I might have occasion to adduce, which it might be difficult to reduce to their proper categories, and I am afraid this is one. The truth is, it is very hard to determine whether *ignorance* or *nonsense* can plead the better title to it. For my part, let them share it between them. I shall only insist a little on one thing more.

3. Then, one of his adversaries, whom he took to task in his "Second Vindication of his Church of Scotland," the author of the Second Letter,[1] had used the phrase *Christian Philosophy*, when G[ilbert] R[ule] thought he should have said *Christian Divinity;* but, if I mistake not, G[ilbert] R[ule], when he wrote his Answer, thought it had been for the author's credit to have foreborn using such a phrase, for never did cock crow more keenly over brother cock when he had routed him, than G[ilbert] R[ule did over the Letterman on that occasion.

He told him (Second Vindication, ad Let. II. § 24, p. 62, 63, edit. Edin.)—"He thought the commendation of a minister had been rather to understand Christian Divinity than Christian Philosophy, but we must not wonder (says he) that men so strongly inclined to Socinianism speak in the Socinian dialect.—For indeed that which goeth for religion among some men is nothing but Platonic philosophy put into a Christian dress, by expressing it in words borrowed (some of them) from the Bible; and the preaching of some men

[1] [This was the learned Bishop himself, who was the writer of the Second and Third of Four Letters, containing "An Account of the Present Persecution of the Church in Scotland." The First was written by the Rev. Thomas Morer, then chaplain to an English regiment in Scotland, afterwards Rector of St Anne's Aldersgate, and Lecturer of St Lawrence Jewry, and the Fourth by the famous Principal Monro.— E.]

is such morality as Seneca and other heathens taught, only christianized with some words," &c. In short, he pursued the poor *Epistler*, as he calls him, so unmercifully, that he never left him till he concluded him an *ignorant talker* for using that phrase.

Now, judicious reader, was it not indeed a demonstration of deep thinking, and a penetrating wit, to make such a plain discovery of such a prodigious spawn of heresies, crowded into one single phrase, consisting of two words, or rather in one solitary *vocable*? I say one vocable, for it was the word *Philosophy* which was the Lerna. I cannot think the word *Christian* was either art or part. Socinianism, Academicism, Stoicism (consistent or inconsistent was all one to our author), all thronged together in one so innocent like an expression! Sad enough! How sad had it been for *sorry Epistler* if there had been a greater confluence of such *isms* in our author's learned *noddle* when he wrote that elaborate paragraph! Had they been in it, it is very like they had come out. However, even these were enough, especially having in their society the fundamental heresie of *ignorance*.

And yet, after all this, I am apt to believe the poor *Epistler* was orthodox and catholic in his meaning. I believe he looked on it as a very harmless phrase, and intended no other thing by it than that which is commonly called *Christian Divinity*. It is twenty to one, he used it as having found it used before him by very honest men who were never suspected of any of these dreadful heresies—the ancient Lights, I mean, and Fathers of the Church, who had scarcely another phrase which they used more frequently or more familiarly. Of this I am sure. If it was not so, it might have been so with him.

My present circumstances do not allow me to cite them so plentifully as might be done; yet I think I can adduce the testimonies of half a dozen, whose authority might have stood between the *Epistler* and all hazard, *e. g.*

Justin Martyr, in his excellent Dialogue with Trypho the Jew, not only asserts the insufficiency of the Platonic, the Peripatetic, the Pythagorean, the Stoic Philosophies, &c. but expressly makes the ancient Prophets who were inspired of God the only true and infallible philosophers (Just.

Opera Græc. edit. Rob. Steph. Lutet. 1551. p. 36). And having told how he himself came to the knowledge of Christianity, he subjoins (p. 37), Ταύτην μόνην εὕρισκον φιλοσοφίαν ἀσφαλῆ τέ καὶ σύμφορον, οὕτως δὲ καὶ διὰ ταῦτα φιλόσοφος ἐγώ. "I have found Christianity to be the only infallible and useful *Philosophy*, and on its account I own myself a *Philosopher*."

Photius, in his Μυριοβ, discoursing of the same Justin, as may be seen at the beginning of Justin's works, describes him thus—Ἔστι δὲ φιλοσοφίας μὲν ὁ ἀνὴρ της τε καθ' ἡμᾶς. "He was a man of our (that is, the *Christian*) philosophy."

Origen, in his learned work against Celsus (edit. Cantab. 1658, p. 9), tells him, if it were possible for all men, laying aside the cares of this life, χολάζειν τῷ φιλοσοφεῖν, to apply themselves to the study of *true* Philosophy, what a blessing would it be to the world! And the very next words declare what *Philosophy* he meant—Εὑρεθήσεται γὰρ ἐν τῳ Χριστιανισμῷ," &c. "For there may be found," says he, "in Christianity most noble and mysterious disquisitions," &c.

Again, page 144, Celsus had alleged that the Christians took pains to proselyte none but young people, ignorants, idiots, &c., and Origen replies—It is not true. They call all men, σοφοὺς καὶ ἀνοήτους, wise and foolish, to the acknowledgment of Christ; and what evil is there in instructing the ignorant? Do not you heathen philosophers the same? Ἢ ὑμῖν μεν ὦ Ἕλληνες ἔξεστι μειράκια καὶ οἰκότριβας καὶ ἀνοήτους ἀνθρωπους ἐπὶ Φιλοσοφίαν καλεῖν, ἡμεῖς δὲ τοῦτο ποιοῦντες οὐ φιλανθρώπως αὐτὸ πράττομεν. "Or is it allowable in you, O heathens, to call young men and servants, and ignorant people, to the study of philosophy, but we Christians, when we do the like, must be condemned of inhumanity?" Once more,

Page 146, Celsus had objected that the Christians taught privately, &c. and Origen answers, they did not refuse to teach publicly, and if people would come to them they would send them πεφιλοσοφῆσθαι, *to be taught Philosophy* by the Prophets of God and the Apostles of Jesus. Whoso pleases to peruse that excellent Apology for Christianity, may find much more to the same purpose. Nay, farther, St Chrysostom, one of G[ilbert] R[ule]'s good acquaintances, has this heretical phrase an hundred times over; *e. g.* in the

page immediately preceding that in which the testimony is which his *Learnedness* glossed so singularly, the holy Father, zealous against such as were Christians in profession only, without a suitable practice, argues thus—"What can one say, ὁρῶν οὐκ ἐν ἔργοις ἀλλ' ἐν λόγοις φιλοσοφοῦντας ἡμᾶς, &c." "When he sees us not in works but in words only, pretending to be philosophers?"—or (for all is one with Chrysostom), to be Christians?

In his sixth Homily on St Matthew he says, God permitted the Jews for a time to offer corporal sacrifices, &c. ἵνα αὐτοὺς κατὰ μικρὸν της συνηθείας ἀποσπάσας ἐπι την ὑψηλὴν ἀγαγῃ φιλοσοφίαν, i. e. "That by degrees he might lead them to the elevated (i. e. the Christian) Philosophy." And doth not the same Father in the same Homilies on Matthew, call our Saviour's Sermon on the Mount, Ἄκρον τὴς φιλοσοφίας—"The top of all Philosophy?"

And in his 4th Homily on 1 Corinthians he discourses elegantly how Christ by the doctrines of the Cross, and evangelical polity, and true godliness and the future judgment, &c. πάντας ἐποίησε φιλοσόφους, hath "made all men, rustics, idiots," &c. philosophers.

Neither is this phrase less frequent with the Latin Fathers. I shall only instance in *two*, but such two as most men use (at least ought) to read, who have a mind to know anything of antiquity. St Cyprian, I mean, and Vincentius Lirinensis.

St Cyprian, in an Epistle to Cornelius, the 57th in number, if I remember right, according to Rigaltius, characterizes Novatianus to this purpose—"Magis Durus Secularis Philosophiæ pravitate, quam Philosophiæ Dominicæ lenitate pacificus." And in his excellent sermon *De Patientia*—"Nos autem, fratres charissimi, qui Philosophi non verbis, sed factis sumus," &c.—"We Christians who are philosophers, not in words, but in deeds," &c.

And Vincentius, in the 30th chapter of his Commonitorium, admires the "Cœlestis Philosophiæ Dogmata," the "Doctrines of the Heavenly (i. e. the *Christian*) Philosophy."

Indeed, some of these Primitive Glories of the Church give us a solid reason for both the orthodoxy and the propriety of the phrase. I cannot tell what notion G[ilbert] R[ule] has of *Philosophy*; but I am pretty sure, according to St Justin's

and St Augustine's notion of it, it is a most proper name for our holy religion.

Justin (ut sup. p. 33) tells Trypho thus—"Εστι γὰρ τῷ ὄντι φιλοσοφία μέγιστον κτῆμα καὶ τιμιώτατον Θεῷ, ὥστε προσάγει καὶ συνίστησιν ἡμὰς μόνη, καὶ ὅσιοι ὡς ἀληθῶς οὗτοι εἰσιν οἱ φιλοσοφίᾳ τὸν νοῦν προσεσχηκότες. "True philosophy is the richest and most honourable possession in the sight of God. It is that which brings us near, and commends us to Him. And they are all truly holy who apply themselves seriously and heartily to the practice of true philosophy." And (page 34) he defines Philosophy thus—'Επιστήμη ἐστι τοῦ ὄντος καὶ τοῦ ἀληθοῦς ἐπίγνωσις, εὐδαιμονία δὲ ταύτης τῆς ἐπιστημης, καὶ τῆς σοφίας γέρας. "Philosophy is the knowledge of God and the acknowledgment of the truth (i. e. of Christ, as I take it); and happiness is the reward of this wisdom and knowledge."

And St Austin, with whose works G[ilbert] R[ule] should have been well acquainted, when he adventured to give him the commendation of being the *great light of the Latin Church*, as he doth in that same 24th section, in the first chapter of his 8th Book, *De Civitate Dei*, discourses thus—"Cum philosophis est habenda collatio quorum ipsum nomen, si Latine interpretemur, amorem sapientiæ profitetur. Porro, si sapientia Deus est, per quem facta sunt omnia, sicut divina authoritas, veritasque monstravit, verus philosophus est amator Dei."—"The word Philosophy," says he, "signifies the love of wisdom. But God is wisdom, as himself hath said in his Word, and therefore a true philosopher is a lover of God."

And in the ninth chapter of that same Book—"Philosophari est amare Deum—unde colligitur tunc fore beatum studiosum Sapientiæ (id enim est Philosophus) cum frui Deo cœperit," i. e. "To philosophize is to love God: One is, then, a true philosopher when he begins to enjoy God," &c. Nay, though G[ilbert] R[ule] should reject the authority of these and twenty other Fathers who have used and justified the phrase, it were no difficult task to find enough of modern writers who have used it, though they were neither *Stoics*, *Platonists*, nor *Socinians*; but I shall only recommend to him two who were his predecessors in that same *chair* which he, now, so worthily possesses. Doctor Leighton, I mean, in his "Valedictory Oration," lately published, and Mr

Colville in his Treatise about Christian Philosophy.[1] And now, let our author's *ignorance* and his *ill-nature* debate it between them, to whether he was most obliged when he so fiercely scourged the poor *Epistler* for talking so *heretically* of *Christian Philosophy*. By this time, I think, the reader may have got a sufficient taste of our renowned *Vindicator's* singular *learning*. Proceed we now,

II. To his next *cardinal virtue*, Profound *learning*, such as our author's, is a teeming mother, and commonly produces congenial brood plentifully. Indeed, never was author's more prolific. His learning has produced crowds of *mysteries*, but such *mysteries* as plain speaking people commonly call *nonsense*. It were *nonsense*, indeed, to insist on all instances of this nature which beautify his writings, such as his pretty position —"That all ceremonies of God's worship are worship themselves" (Animadversions on Dr Stillingfleet's Irenicum, p. 30.) His pleasant *fetch* about "Ceremonies that stand in the place of the *Competentes* or *Catechumeni*" (Rational Defence, &c. p. 72). His judicious conclusion—"That the affirmative part of the Second Commandment is, that we ought to worship God in the way prescribed in his Word" (Ibid. 125.) His sublime notion about the *unity* of the Church in the case of the Lutherans (Ibid. 148). "We shut not out the Lutheran Churches," says he, "from all possibility of union with them; we can have union with them as sister Churches, but we cannot partake in their instituted parts of worship." His surprizing proposition, viz.—"That the two governments (Presbytery and Monarchy) of Church and State have suited one another many ages since the nation was Protestant." (Second Vindication, § 11. p. 14).

It were to *vie* with him for his own *talent*, I say, to insist on all these and many more such, which are to be found in his matchless writings. I shall, therefore, mention only three or four of his most *elaborate mysteries*.

And, 1. Our judicious author wrote "Animadversions" on Doctor Stillingfleet's "Irenicum," and you may judge of the metal of the whole by this one specimen, which you have not far from the beginning.

Dr Stillingfleet (p. 2) had laid down this foundation—"That

[1] [To which we may add Dr Vicesimus Knox. Vide Knox's Essays, vol. iv.— E.]

difference of opinion about a point, and probable arguments brought on both sides, by wise and able men, if it be not a matter of necessity to salvation, gives men ground to think that a final decision of the matter in controversie was never intended as a necessary means for the peace and unity of the Church."

Against this position G[ilbert] R[ule] reasons thus (p. 5)— "If any things not necessary to salvation be so necessary to be clearly revealed, that we are to look upon them as not Christ's truth, if there remain a controversie about them, managed with specious arguments on both sides, among wise and able men, much more things necessary to salvation must be thus clearly revealed, so that there is no truth in them if they be so controverted; but the consequent is most false and absurd. Ergo," &c. Let the reader try his skill on this *mystery*, and fathom the *depth* of it if he can.

2. The next *mystery* I thought to have insisted on, is that grand one about the decrees of God (Second Vindication, p. 66), viz. that God has a "decree that is *præteritum* as an act of sovereignty, and a decree that is *prædamnatum*, as an act of justice." But I am told this has been sufficiently represented already, and therefore I shall say no more about it but this, that there is no reason to think it was a *typographical* error; for after it was thus printed in Scotland, it was reprinted in England without alteration or correction, so that there is all the reason in the world to impute it to the author. But if so, was he not at best a *mysterious theologue*?

But 3. The next I shall produce, though not sounding so directly towards *blasphemy*, is every whit as good *mystery*. The story is this:—

Doctor Stillingfleet, in his "Unreasonableness of the Separation from the Church of England," forbore to sustain the lawfulness of Liturgies, &c. because Dr Falkener had done it so well before. But our author had "made some collections on the subject." (Rational Defence, &c. p. 222). And it was pity they should be stifled, and therefore they behoved to be published. I am not to insist on every thing that is *mysterious* in that learned disquisition on the subject of Liturgies with which he has *blessed* the island. One thing shall suffice.

In his burning zeal against *Liturgies*, or *Set Forms*, he

advances this proposition, among many others—"That it is unlawful to worship God by a frame of service that is not warranted in the Word, both as to its matter and manner," (Page 226, sect 8).

"This I prove," says he, "1. From Christ's condemning the traditions of men as vain worship, Matt. xv. 9. They taught these traditions, i. e. (saith Lucas Brugensis in locum) they followed them, and taught others to follow them. The same author calleth these men's traditions that are so, of men, that they are not of God, or are devised by man (Ibid.) So also Vatablus, Erasmus, Maldonate, Tirinus, Piscator, Calvin, and Chemnitius say, here is meant whatever is brought into religion without the Word. Now it is manifest that a frame of divine service not warranted in the Word falleth under this general head." Thus, you have all these gentlemen, Lucan Brugensis, Vatablus, Erasmus, &c. (though some of them were *Papists*, some of them *Lutherans*, and not one of them but owned and used *Liturgies*), strong against *Liturgies*, if not *directly*, at least by *plain consequence*. But our author proceeds.

"Secondly, the Lord condemneth all worship offered up to him that he hath not commanded," Jer. vii. 31—(turn to the text, and try if it is not pertinently adduced)—"Where not being commanded, but devised by men, is made the ground on which that practice, though otherwise evil also, is condemned, and Jeroboam's frame and way of service is condemned, because devised (Heb. *created*) of his own heart, 1 Kings xii. 33."

"Thirdly, even reason teacheth that God ought to choose how he will be honoured or worshipped by his creatures. He best knoweth what will please him, and his sovereignty in all things must especially appear in this that himself is so nearly concerned in. This is a principle so rooted in nature, that among the heathens, they that contrived their liturgies, or ways of worship, behoved to pretend revelations from their gods to guide them in this. It was never heard of among the more religious heathens that religion, or the manner of worshipping their gods, was enjoined only by man's authority, and devised only by him; yea, in the so much magnified Rosary of the Virgin Mary, it is alleged that Saint Dominicus had it revealed by the Virgin herself

that this form of service was most acceptable to her; and it is added, that she was fittest to choose what way she would be worshipped. I hope they (the Papists), and such as symbolize with them, those of the Church of England, in ordering of the worship of God, will give us leave to say the same of her blessed Son."

"Fourthly, for the matter of worship, I think it will not be questioned whether that must be appointed by God or not; but even the FRAME, CONPOSURE, and MODE of Divine worship, should have Divine warrant, otherwise it is not acceptable to God, &c."

Now, not to make much needless work, consider, 1, Our author's great business was to prove the unlawfulness of *Liturgies*, or *Set Forms* of prayers, &c. in the public worship. Consider, 2, That he (as his *sect* generally) is against using the *Lord's Prayer*, the only prayer I can find of Divine institution in the New Testament, as to the MATTER, FRAME, COMPOSURE, and MODE of it. Consider, 3, That our author would be very angry, and complain of horrid injustice done him, if you should charge him with Quakerism, or praying by immediate inspiration; for who so great enemies to Quakers as Scottish Presbyterians? Consider, 4, If his arguments can consist any better with extemporary prayers, which are not immediately inspired, and, by consequence, cannot be of Divine institution as to MATTER, FRAME, COMPOSURE, and MODE, than with set forms which are not of Divine institution as to MATTER, FRAME, COMPOSURE, and MODE. Consider, 5, In consequence of these, if we can have any *public prayers* at all. And then consider, 6, and lastly, If our author, when he wrote this section, had his *zeal* tempered with *common sense*, and if he was not *knuckle deep* in right *mysterious* theology.

4. But as good follows; for never man spoke more *profound mysteries* than he hath done on all occasions in his surprizing accounts of the "Church of Scotland." He tells us of a *Popish Church* of *Scotland* since the *Reformation*, and a *Protestant Church* of *Scotland*.

He tells us (First Vindication, Answer to Quest. 1, § 10)—"Presbyterians do not say that the law made by the Reforming Parliament, anno 1576, took from them (the Popish Bishops) the authority they had over the Popish Church;

but it is manifest that after this law they had no legal title to rule the Protestant Church."

This same, for once, is pleasant enough. The *Reforming* Parliament, while it *defined* the Church of Scotland, and it *defined* it so as to make it but *one*, as is evident from Act 6, which I have transcribed word for word in my book, allowed of *two Churches* of *Scotland*, two *national* Churches in one *nation*. But this is not all. He hath also subdivided the "Protestant Church of Scotland" into "two Churches of Scotland"—the "Presbyterian Church of Scotland," and the "Episcopal Church of Scotland."

He insists very frequently on the "Presbyterian Church of Scotland." Thus, in his Preface to his "First Vindication" of *his* Church of Scotland, in great seriousness he tells the world that "that which is determined concerning all them that will live godly in Christ Jesus that they must suffer persecution, is, and has long been, the lot of the PRESBYTERIAN Church of Scotland." And in his Preface to his "Second Vindication," § 7—"I have in a former paper pleaded for the PRESBYTERIAN Church of Scotland against an adversary," &c. And in answer to the "Historical Relation of the General Assembly," § 12, his adversary had said "that General Assembly was as insufficient to represent the Church of Scotland as that of Trent was to represent the Catholic Church." And G[ilbert] R[ule] readily replies—"But he cannot deny that it represented the PRESBYTERIAN Church, and was all that could be had of a PRESBYTERIAN Assembly."

He is as frank at allowing an "Episcopal Church of Scotland." Thus, in "True Representation of Presbyterian Government," in Answer to Objection 10)—"The ministers that entered by and under Prelacy neither had nor have any right to be rulers in the PRESBYTERIAN Church. Whatever they might have in ANOTHER [governing][1] Church"—i. e. the Episcopal Church—"that the State set up in the nation," &c. And more expressly in Answer to the Historical Relation of the General Assembly 1690, § 3—"Again," says he, "though we own them"—the Prelatick Presbyters—"as lawful ministers, yet we cannot own them as ministers of the PRESBYTERIAN Church. They may have a right to govern the EPISCOPAL Church, to which they had betaken them-

[1] [Not in the original text.—E.]

selves, and left the PRESBYTERIAN, yet that they have a right to rule the PRESBYTERIAN Church we deny."

By this time I think the reader has got enough of "Scottish National Churches," and their distinct governors and governments. The "Popish Clergy," even since the Reformation was established by law, have right to rule the "Popish National Church of Scotland." The "Protestant Episcopal Clergy" have right to rule the "Protestant Episcopal National Church of Scotland." The Protestant Presbyterian members have only right to rule the "Protestant Presbyterian National Church of Scotland." By the way,

May not one wish that he and his party had stood here? For if the "Episcopal Clergy" have *right* to rule the "Episcopal Church;" and if it was only *right* to rule the "Presbyterian Church," which they had not, why was their own *right* to rule themselves taken from them? Are not the Presbyterians *unrighteous* in taking from them all *right* to *rule*, when they have *right* to *rule* the "Episcopal Church of Scotland?" But this, as I said, only by the way. That which I am mainly concerned for at present is, that the reader may consider if there is not a goodly parcel of goodly sense in these profound meditations. Yet better follows.

After all this laborious clearing of marches between Scottish National Churches, particularly the "Episcopal" and "Presbyterian National Churches of Scotland," he tells you, for all that, they are but *one Church of Scotland;* but in such depth of mystery as perchance can scarcely be paralleled. Take the worthy speculation in his own words. (True Representation, ad Objection 10). "Let it be further considered,"[1] says he, "that though we are not willing so to widen the difference between us and the Prelatic party as to look on them and ourselves as two distinct Churches; yet it is evident that their clergy and we are two different representatives, and two different governing bodies of the Church

[1] [The passage within parenthesis is not to be found in the copy of the "True Representation of Presbyterian Government" which is in the hands of the Editor, although the next words quoted by our author in this page follow in due course. It is not to be supposed that Bishop Sage would have quoted a passage for ridicule which did not exist; and therefore it is probable that Mr Gilbert Rule, finding himself vulnerable on this point, very wisely ordered it to be expunged from the copy of his pamphlet "reprinted by the heirs of Andrew Anderson, 1690."—E.]

of Scotland; and that they who are members of the one, cannot at their pleasure go over to the other, unless they be received by them."

Well! Has he now retracted his making them *two* Churches? You may judge of that by what follows in the very next words; for thus he goes on—"These things, thus laid down, let us hear what is objected against this course"—the course the Presbyterians were pursuing with might and main, when he wrote this book, viz. that the government of the Church might *prima instantia* be put in the hands of the *known sound* Presbyterian ministers, &c.—"First, this is to set up Prelacy among ministers, even while it is so much decried, that a few should have rule of the Church and the rest excluded."—Answer. "It is not Prelacy, but a making distinction between ministers of ONE SOCIETY and those of ANOTHER. Though they be ministers, they are not ministers of the Presbyterian Church. They have departed from it; we have continued in the good old way that they and we professed"—for who can doubt that all the Scottish Prelatists were *once Presbyterians?*—"It is not, then, unreasonable, that if they will return to that SOCIETY they should be admitted by it," &c.

Now, what can be plainer than it is, hence, that they must be still *two* Churches? He makes them in express terms twice over two distinct SOCIETIES. He makes one of these Societies the "Presbyterian Church;" of necessity, therefore, the other must be the "Episcopal Church;" and is not this unavoidably to make two Churches? Yet, neither is this the true yolk of the mystery, as I take it. That lies here—That the Episcopal clergy and the Presbyterian clergy are two different representatives, two different governing bodies of the one Church of Scotland. I remember our author, in his "Rational Defence of Nonconformity," &c. exercised Dr Stillingfleet to purpose for talking of something which he thought looked like two Convocations in England, viz. the Upper and the Lower Houses. "He seems above," says G[ilbert] R[ule], "to make such convocations, and so there must be either two Churches of England"—(and why not, as well as these of Scotland?)—"or the one Church of England must be *biceps*, and so a *monster*."

Thus our author there (p. 195), I say; and it seems he

was mindful of it when he wrote his "True Representation of Presbyterian Government." For he was careful, indeed, to avoid the making of his *one* Church of Scotland *biceps*, and made it *something* else. But what *thing?* Your pardon for that: I have neither Latin nor English name for it. I thought once, indeed, on *bicorpor*, but I found it could not do; for he makes not his *one* Church *two* Bodies. What then? I told you already, I can find no name for it; but if I have any *idea* of this his *one* Church, she is such a thing as this—"A Body governed by two different governing Bodies without an Head."

That she is a *Body*, I think, cannot be controverted, for all Churches are commonly owned to be *Bodies*.

That she is governed by *two different governing Bodies* is clear from the text, for thus it runs:—"We will not so widen the difference between us and the Prelatical party, as to look on ourselves and them as two distinct Churches; yet it is evident that their clergy and we are two different representatives, and two different governing Bodies of the *Church of Scotland*."

That she is governed by these *two* different governing Bodies *without an Head* is likewise evident, for there is not so much as one syllable about an *Head* in the text; and there is all the reason in the world for it. For, besides the difficulty of joining *an Head* conveniently with *two Bodies*, to what purpose *an Head* for her when she is so well stored of *governing Bodies?* Are they not received maxims, that—"Non sunt multiplicanda entia sine necessitate," and—"Deus et natura nihil faciunt frustra?" The definition, then, is unquestionable.

Well! Perhaps the reader may be curious to know how G[ilbert] R[ule] came by this superfine *idea* of a *Church*, I have had my conjectures about it, and the most probable that offered was this:—

No doubt he is wondrously well acquainted with Plato, otherwise how could he have made the singular discovery that *Socinians* and *Stoics* were Platonists? Now, Plato (Conviv. p. 322, edit. Lugd. 1590), as I remember, has a pretty story about a certain species of rational animals which were early in the world, and which he calls Ἀνδρογυνος, as if you would say *Man-woman*, or so. This creature had two

faces, two noses, four hands, &c. In a word, it was a round body, which contained both sexes in it, *man* and *woman*, as it were, united by their *backs*. It was a vigorous, sturdy kind of animal, and Jupiter turned afraid of it; and therefore, to weaken it, and make it more toward and subdueable, he took an axe, or some such sharp instrument, and clave it from top to bottom, in the very middle, as if you should cleave an egg into two equal halves; and then, being (as you know) a nimble mountebank, he drew together the skin on each back in a trice, and applied some sovereign medicines, and both backs were made sound immediately; and the divided parts of the "Ανδρογυνος being now "Ανηρ and Γυνη, *man* and *woman*, and having the felicity to look one another in the face, they fell in love with one another; and this was the original of love, and courting, and marriage, and all that. Now, I say,

The most probable conjecture I can make of the way how G[ilbert] R[ule] came by his surprizing idea of the *one Church* with the *two different governing Bodies* is, that when he read this story in Plato, it made a deep impression on his imagination; and he, labouring to outdo Plato at nimbleness of design and invention, fell upon this stranger and more surprizing *notion* of a *Church*. But however this was,

I think our author had reason to say (Animadversions on Irenicum p. 51), "That a Church is a singular Society, and of another nature than other Societies, and therefore she ought to have a singular government." For, sure I am, he has given the *one* Church of Scotland a *government* which is *singular* enough. One thing is certain,

At this rate, she wants not *government* nor *governors*, and, of all the Churches in the world, she is likest to have the best Canons and the justest measures prescribed to her; for if the *one governing Body* prescribes wrong, the *other* must readily prescribe *right*, for never were *two governing Bodies* of one Society in greater likelihood of contradicting one another. It is true, the *governed Body* may be sometimes puzzled about its obedience, and reduced to a state of hesitation about the opposite prescriptions, whither of them it should follow; but that is but a small matter. Our author's invention is not yet so far decayed but that I can promise for him, if he pleases, he shall as easily extricate

it out of that difficulty as he can give an intelligible account of this his *one Church* with the *two different governing Bodies*. Only one thing more I add.

Our learned author tells us in his Preface to this his book, in which he has this *mystery*, that "it was a work not undertaken at first of his own private motion, and that (before it was published) it passed an *examen rigorosum* of not a few brethren." Now, if he spoke truth here (as I am apt to believe he did not), the world may judge of the accuracy of some men's *rigorosa examina;* and so much for a taste of our author's second *cardinal virtue*. Proceed we now to

III. The *third*, which, though it looks as like *ill-nature* as ever egg was like another, in compliance with our author's generous inclinations I am content should pass under the name of his *excessive civility*. I allow it this name, I say, because our author himself hath so dubbed it.

For thus he tells us (Second Vindication, Preface, § 6)—"I have treated the adversaries I deal with as brethren, desiring rather to EXCEED than come short in CIVILITY and fair dealing with them."

Never was author more plentifully furnished with this ingenuous quality than G[ilbert] R[ule]. Take a specimen of it from his "Second Vindication," &c. edit. Edin. anno 1691; and consider with what *excess* of *civility* he treats his adversaries.

The author of the "First" of "the Four Letters"—that "military chaplain" (p. 14), "that man of a vain mind" (p. 19), "was guilty of the height of disingenuity" (p. 9), "and it was the highest impudence and sauciness for a stranger" (such as he was) "thus to reproach the representative of a nation, where he was so civilly treated" (p. 12). And yet the whole nation knows the gentleman had asserted nothing but *truth*, when he met with this *civility* from our author.

The author of the Second and Third Letters was "blinded with rage" (p. 22), "was guilty of shameful hypocrisy twisted with malice" (p. 23), "His words were full of monstrous hyperbolies, if not plain forgeries" (p. 28). "He exposed his own folly, malice, and silly credulity" (p. 42); "was guilty of the highest efforts of malice, blinding the mind, and depraving the apprehension of things" (p. 45). "His ignorant malice not to be answered but despised"

(p. 52). " Judas Iscariot was his predecessor" (Ibid). " He was a choleric Momus, whose patron was Rabshakeh" (56). He vindicated the Prelatists from being persecutors "with a confidence in asserting falsehoods and denying known truths beyond any degree, that any sort of man, except Jesuits, have arrived at" (p. 67). " He told things absurd above measure" (p. 69). G[ilbert] R[ule] can convince the reader—" if the author of this letter was the person whom he guessed, of his most absurd and habitual lying, known to most of the nation even to a proverb" (p. 71). But I am apt to think he guessed wrong; but whoever he was, " he wrote in such a violent and insolent style as deserved an answer of another nature than a paper refutation," i. e. the *gallows*, as I take it.

" The Fourth Letter was not inferior to any of the rest in abominable lies and reproaches" (p. 81). " The most bitter invectives that could be invented filled up this author's few pages" (Ibid). " What he wrote was not to be refuted more than the words of a madman, or of one raging in a fever" (Ibid). In a word, " This Letter was so unexaminable, so full of virulent reproaches, and so void of any thing that was argumentative, that it was impossible for any man to answer it, except his talent for railing, and his conscience to say what he would, true or false, was equal to that of this gentleman's." (Ibid).

The author of the " Case of the Afflicted Clergy," &c. " spake rage and fury," (p. 84) was a malicious calumniator" (p. 89), " a common liar" (p. 101), " most petulantly reproached the government" (p. 110). Twenty more such *excessive civilities* he paid him.

The author of the late Letter, I think, had done well to have saved himself the labour of writing it; for if he got not his share of G[ilbert] R[ule's] *excessive civilities*, G[ilbert] R[ule] himself was mistaken. " This piece was behind none of the rest in effronted and bold lies, and to say this might be a just refutation of the whole book" (p. 117). " This author spake broad-faced lies" (Ibid). " Impudent and broad lies, gross and malicious lies, bold calumnies" (p. 113), " shameless lies, slanderous forgeries" (p. 119). " He maliciously belyed his nation" (Ibid). " Spat venom" (p. 121). " Lying and misrepresentation were

familiar to him" (p. 122). " He most impudently obtruded upon people's credulity" (p. 125). " Was *perfrictæ frontis*" (p. 126). " Nothing, though never so certainly and manifestly false, could choke his conscience" (Ibid). " He spued out the most spiteful venom that could lodge in a human breast" (p. 136). Forty more such *civilities* he paid him, and it was reasonable to treat him so; for " the impudent accusations of this scribbler, and the obligation that lay on persons and Churches to necessary self-defence, constrained G[ilbert] R[ule] to treat him thus *civilly*" (p. 137).

The author of the " Memorial"[1] (though I am apt to think G[ilbert] R[ule] knew he was dead before his " Second Vindication" was published) got *civilities* paid him of the same stamp, and out of the same repository; for the " Memorial was a print full of bitter and unreasonable invectives" (p. 137), " full of malicious insinuations" (Ibid). " It was nothing short of the rest for most gross falsehoods in matters of fact, and most injurious representations of the Presbyterian way and principles" (Ibid). " The moral qualities of the author might be seen by his book to be none of the best" (Ibid). " It was a parcel of false and malicious history as ever was written in so few lines" (Ibid). " It began and ended with lies and railing" (Ibid). " A man who took liberty to slander at that rate of impudence deserved rather chastisement than an answer" (p. 138). The writer was but a " Scribbler" (p. 139). " He wrote neither like a Christian nor like an historian" (p. 140). He wrote " perfect railing" (Ibid). " He accused the Presbyterians with a bloody mouth of what had been a thousand times refuted as an horrid lie, viz. that the Scottish Presbyterians did perfidiously give up their King to the English, who murdered him" (Ibid). Now, if there was reason for being at the expence of such an *excessive civility* on this occasion, let the world judge. And, indeed, it is a most surprizing defence G[ilbert] R[ule] made for his Scottish Presbyterians in that matter. Why? " He was the King of the English" (forsooth) " as well as theirs, and they could not withhold him from them;" so that the whole matter was no more than if an English ox had *strayed* or been *stolen*, and falling into the

[1] [The learned Dr Alexander Monro, Principal of the University of Edinburgh.—E.]

hands of Scottish Presbyterians, they had restored him, and got so much for reward; at most it was not the ox's price, it was only *black mail*, as we call it. But to proceed. This author of the Memorial advanced assertions "beyond what Jesuitical impudence itself hath ever arrived at" (p. 142). And, which is worst of all, worse than any thing that ever proceeded from the mouth of "Platonist, Stoic, Socinian, or Jesuit, he most wickedly reproached the Covenant" (p. 146.)

The author of the "Annotations" on the "Presbyterian Address," &c. "quibbled more like a buffoon than a disputant," (p. 147), "and wrote so pure railing, as admitted of no other answer, but to brand the whole of it with this *motto*, that it was void of truth and honesty," (p. 150).

But God a mercy on the miserable author[1] of the "Historical Relation of the General Assembly," &c. What an *heterogeneous* piece of the creation was he! "The most fit refutation of this pamphlet were to write on the margin of every page, LIES and CALUMNIES" (p. 150). This author spake "broad lies" (p. 151). "Was a delicious scribbler" (p. 156). "His fancy was tinctured with malice and prejudice" (p. 161). "He advanced whole fardels of lies and malicious representations" (p. 162). "He gave no proof of either sense or learning in his book, but many demonstrations of spite and railing" (p. 165). "His tongue was set on fire of hell, and his kind respects to any man were indeed a reproach to him" (p. 166). "He had abandoned all reason and good nature" (Ibid). "Had a brazen forehead" (Ibid). "Nothing could escape the lash of his virulent pen" (Ibid). "His tongue was no slander" (p. 168). "He was nothing but a "Sciolist" (p. 169). "A choleric scribbler" (p. 170). "His paper was loaden with lies" (Ibid). "He was not ashamed to tell lies in the face of the sun" (p. 171). "He had so inured himself to the foulest *lies* and *calumnies*, that he could hardly speak or write truth" (p. 175). "He was a reviler" (p. 182). "A railing scribbler who censured and condemned all Presbyterians without wit or discretion" (p. 114). In short, "he was a snarling cur" (p. 191), "and a spirit of lying had possessed him" (p. 192).

Thus, I think, I have given a taste of our author's *excessive civilities* to the adversaries he answered in his "Second

[1] [Bishop Sage himself.—E.]

Vindication." What a formidable author had he been, if he had suffered himself to have treated his antagonists with such *just* (not to say *excessive*) *severities* as they deserved! What authors have these been, to whom such treatment was nothing else than *excessive civility?* So strangers might think who were not acquainted with G[ilbert] R[ule]'s *nature*. *His nature*, I say; for indeed it seems to be *natural* to him to *exceed* thus in *civility* towards all the authors he ever dealt with, at least so far as I can learn by such of his books as I have had the *luck* to be *edified* withal. Thus—

In his "Preface" to his "First Vindication" he discharges thus against the author of the "Ten Questions," &c.—"Now, when their" (the Prelatists') "hands are tyed, that they can no more afflict her" (his *Presbyterian Church* of Scotland), "their tongues and pens are let loose to tear her without mercy, by the most virulent invectives, and the most horrid lies and calumnies that their wit can invent." And in answer to Question 4, § 2, he adorns him with the honourable title of *controversial scribbler;* and the first words of his answer to the Sixth Question are singularly complimental. "It may be observed from this author's conduct" (says he) "in his pamphlet, what it is to be fleshed in bold averring of what all the world knoweth to be manifest untruths. Some, by boldness and frequency in telling lies, have come at last to believe them as truths," &c.

I have also seen two books written by him against Dr Stillingfleet; one against his "Irenicum," another against his "Unreasonableness of the Separation," &c. In both G[ilbert] R[ule] is *excessively civil* to the Dr after his wonted manner.

In his Preface to "Animadversions on Irenicum," he says, the Doctor "exposed himself between principle and preferment." In the book he calls him "an abettor of scepticism" (p. 5). "For the most part he doth nothing but *magno conatu nihil agere*" (p. 18). "He evidently contradicts himself," and G[ilbert] R[ule] wonders "to meet with contradictions so often in so learned an author" (p. 22). "Contradictions are no rarities in him" (p. 27). "It was impudently said by the Doctor that our Saviour kept the Feast of the Dedication" (p. 124). "His propositions are such reflections on Scripture that any but a Papist may be ashamed of" (p. 132). These and twenty more such *regular civilities* he pays him.

He is more *civil* to him, yet, in his *learned answer* to the Doctor's "Unreasonableness of the Separation," &c. The Doctor wrote "unexpected incoherencies" (p. 4). "Used wonderful confidence" (p. 9). "Jeered the zeal and warmth of devotion" (p. 16). "Was blinded with passion" (p. 20). "A taunter" (p. 21). "Advanced fallacious if not false history" (p. 41). "Would have things so and so in despight of history" (p. 50). "Woe to the world if such false and partial history carries the day!" (p. 52). (Just the same upon the matter with his "woe to posterity if the lying stories which some have printed, and with bold impudence avouched, pass with them for authentic histories," Preface to Second Vindication, § 1. So that the readers of that "Vindication" need not be much amused with such *cant*. It follows of *course* with our author.) But to go on with his *civilities* to Dr Stillingfleet, the Doctor used "ratiocinations that would better become Pharisees" (p. 68). Asserted things "so rashly and falsely," that G[ilbert] R[ule] had no name for such "assertions" (p. 69). "His prejudices darkened his understanding" (p. 85). "He made a mad exposition of the Second Commandment" (p. 125). "Stretched and forced Scripture" (p. 126). "Spake things beyond comprehension" (p. 148). "Made unbecoming reflections on the Word of God" (p. 189). "Used sorry shifts" &c. (p. 204). "Outfaced plain light" (p. 206). "Wearied not of writing beside the purpose" (p. 210.) Advanced "conceits unworthy of a divine, and only fit for Simon Magus" (p. 214). "He did not act the part of a disputant, or a casuist, but of somewhat else," our author thought shame "*to name*" (p. 275). These and God knows how many more such wonderful *civilities* he paid the Doctor; particularly two, for which, no doubt, G[ilbert] R[ule] stretched his invention. Dr Stillingfleet had said something concerning the "English" ceremonies (it is no great matter what it was), and G[ilbert] R[ule] replies wittily (p. 55)—"This is so indigested a notion that it doth not well become the learning of Doctor Stillingfleet, though it be good enough for some to rant with over a pot of ale." How many good glasses of *forty-nine (alias* good *sack)* has our author got for this? Again, the Doctor had said that the cross in Baptism was a ceremony of admitting one into the Church of England. "But I doubt," says G[ilbert R[ule],

"it will prove but a mouse brought forth by the long labour and hard throes of a mountain." Was not this a pure flight—a lofty paraphrase on *parturiunt montes*?

Thus we have seen a sample of his *excessive civilities* to such single persons as had the honour to be his adversaries. What a pity had it been if such *civilities* had been only dispensed to half a dozen of individuals? Our author, no doubt, was sensible of this, and therefore he has even thought fit, when he had occasion, to extend them to whole Churches, particularly the Episcopal Church of Scotland and the Church of England. Indeed, the whole body of the Episcopal clergy of Scotland have got a large share of his *civilities*. Take this *specimen* only from his "Second Vindication," &c.

"Presbyterians are all Jacobs, and Prelatists Esaus" (Preface, § 1). "Presbyterians the seed of the woman, Prelatists the seed of the serpent" (Ibid). The Prelatists are a "spiteful and clamorous sort of men" (§ 5). "Men enraged by being deprived of the opportunity they had to persecute their neighbours" (Book, p. 1). "Their course is diametrically opposite to moderation" (p. 2). They are men of "mean spirits and mercenary souls" (p. 4). "Unfaithful men" (p. 17). "Men who use unmanly as well as unchristian shifts" (p. 25). "Most of them who were put out" *i. e.* thrust from their habitations and the exercise of their ministry since the beginning of the late Revolution, "were put out by their own consciences" (p. 36). "Arminians" (p. 60). Socinians" (p. 61). "The contempt of the ministry came from the atheism and debauches of the clergy" (p. 64). "Their immoral men may be counted by hundreds" (p. 65). "They are generally liars" (p. 70). "Men who exposed the nation to the reproach of barbarity" (p. 24). "Men of a restless temper, embittered in their spirits by what inconvenience they are fallen into, from the ease and dominion over their brethren which they lately had" (p. 84). "Men justly loathsome and a burden to the people" (p. 99). "Instead of feeding their flocks, they worried them" (p. 103). "Inciters to, and abetters of persecution" (p. 126). "A faction that indulged debauched men in their immoralities" (p. 166). "Hundreds of their party guilty of gross immoralities for one Presbyterian" (p. 166). "Their debauchery tempts people to count

all religion a sham" (p. 173). "Generally favourers of Popery" (passim). "Men who are wiser than to comply with the present Establishment of the Church, from which it is like they would have been excluded for their immoralities or errors" (p. 5). And God knows how frequently he makes them generally "ignorant or erroneous, or scandalous, or supinely negligent." This, I think, may serve for a *trial* of his *excessive civilities* to the Scottish clergy. Well!

But is he as civil to the Church of England? Take a proof from his "Rational Defence," &c. Those of the Church of England "seem wiser than Christ and his Apostles, from whom they do manifestly and confessedly differ in the things controverted" between them and the Nonconformists (p. 71). "They are either strangers to England, or strangely biassed, who see not cause to complain of the ignorance, idleness, and vicious conversation of the *English* clergy" (p. 40). "It is the spirit of the party still to create trouble to the Church" (p. 63). "They are an imperious superstitious clergy, that will be lords over God's inheritance in despight of the Apostle" (p. 80). And how often doth he call them "liars, misrepresenters, calumniators," &c.? (Vide p. 66, 274, 275, 276, &c.)

I shall only mention one instance of the *English* Episcopal knavery, which G[ilbert] R[ule] resents very highly. You may see it, page 276. "I have met with another instance" says he, "of Episcopal ingenuity for exposing the Presbyterians among the foreign Churches. It is in a letter of the famous Bochart, dated November 2, 1630, in answer to a letter from Doctor Morley, wherein the Doctor representeth the Presbyterian principles in three positions, whereof the third is a GROSS CALUMNY. The position is—Reges posse vi et armis a subditis cogi in ordinem, et si se præbeant immorigeros, de soliis deturbari, in carcerem conjici, sisti in jus, per carnificem denique capite plecti. i. e. That Presbyterians maintain that subjects may call their sovereigns to an account by force of arms; and if they are stubborn, incorrigible sovereigns, they may cast them in prison, judge them, sentence them, and order the hangman to give them a cast of his craft." And now, kind reader, judge impartially, was not this a *gross calumny*? What impudent lying rogues must these English Prelates and Pre-

latists have been who so *grossly calumniated* such eminently loyal subjects, such true friends to monarchy, such unquestionable *passive obedience* and *non-resistance men*?[1] But return we to our Author.

One thing may be pleaded in his behalf. It is, that this his "Rational Defence," &c. (as he says himself), was written about the time that K[ing] J[ames] came to the throne, i. e. some four years before the late Revolution, and at that time it was excuseable in him to tell his mind freely about the English clergy, because he was then a Nonconformist in England, and suffering under their yoke; but now that Presbytery is established in Scotland, and he has got a *post* there in which he can live to purpose, his temper is become a little sweetened, and he will not any more be an enemy to the English clergy. Nay, has he not published so much lately in his "Second Vindication?"

True! He has. More he seems to have *promised*, at least *professed* so much, not only for himself, but for his whole party. He has told the world in his answer to the First of the Four Letters, § 12—"That Scottish Presbyterians are far from interposing in the Church of England's affairs; that they are not bound by the Covenant to reform England, but to concur, when lawfully called, to advance reformation That it is far from their thoughts to go beyond that boundary. That they wish their reformation, but leave the management of it to themselves." And in his "Answer to the Case of the Afflicted clergy," &c. § 1, he goes a farther length. The author had said "that the Church of England should bethink themselves how to quench the flames in Scotland," &c.; and G[ilbert] R[ule] answers—"Thus they sow discord among brethren, and animate England to concern

[1] [The biting sarcasm of those words will strike all who remember the infamous compact made at Newcastle between the leaders of the Covenanting Army and the Commissioners of the English rebels, by which Charles I., who had thrown himself upon the honour and loyalty of his Scottish subjects, was sold for a sum of money into the hands of his implacable foes. In allusion to this sordid and base transaction, a recent historian remarks—"The prospect of establishing Presbyterianism in England was held out by Cromwell as a snare to the leaders of the party, and this was one of their inducements to sell the King; fanaticism thus uniting with avarice in the most odious transaction which stains the annals of the Scottish nation."—E.]

themselves in the affairs of our Church, when we do not meddle in their matters." Here, you see, he owns the English clergy for no less than his *brethren*. Are they not *cock-sure* now, they shall never have more of his *excessive civilities?* Well! I cannot tell what *may be*, but I can tell something of what hath already *been*.

This same *loving brother* to the Church of England published his "Rational Defence," &c. anno 1689, i. e. since the beginning of the late Revolution, and it is evident his Preface was written since likewise; for therein he discourses rhetorically—"How God, by the late Revolution, hath made us like them that dream, and done exceeding abundantly for us above what we could think, outdone our faith, as was foretold, Luke xviii. 8."

Now, in that same Preface he owns he published his book then because he thought it a fit season, and it seemed allowable, if not necessary, "that each party should put in their claim, and give the best reasons they could for their pretensions"—which, how it consisted with designs for the peace of the Church of England, let herself consider. This I am sure of, if his *excessive civilities* could be helpful for *unhinging* her, she got them in that Preface with a witness. Take this for a taste.

He not only exhorts his readers "to purge the Church of England of bad men, an ignorant, scandalous, heady, and unsober ministry," but he further discourses thus—"God will not be at peace with the Church while such are countenanced; and good men cannot with any satisfaction behold such scandals to religion, and such effectual instruments of the ruin of souls, continued in the Church. While some effectual course is not taken to remove them, the Church is like to have little peace either with God or in herself.—Let all, then, contribute their endeavours to have the unsavoury salt cast out.—If this piece of reformation be endeavoured, all ranks must put hand to it;—the people, by discovering such where they are, and not calling or countenancing them when they want a guide to their souls;—and magistrates by endeavouring the regulating of such laws as do in any wise open the door to such men to enter." And again—"Church reformation must also be truly endeavoured by us, if we would have Church peace. It is no token for good when sinful

evils, images of jealousy which provoke the Lord to jealousy"—such as Episcopacy, the Liturgy, Ceremonies, Holidays, &c.—" are in the Church, and yet all agree in these way; none lament them nor reprove them, nor take care to keep their garments clean from the corruptions of the time," &c. Now, that all this is directly intended against the Church of England, is evident from the whole contexture of that Preface.

By this time the reader, I think, has got enough of G[ilbert] R[ule's] *excessive civilities* to all persons and Churches he has been pleased to take notice of. Proceed we now to the last of his *cardinal virtues*, viz.

IV. His singular *modesty*. And here a vast field opens, for, except the aforesaid three, there is scarcely another of his *qualities*, good or bad, that makes any considerable appearance; but so it is, that generally the *greater* lights obscure the *lesser*. Nay, such an *awkward* quality is this in our author, that one would think it has been at feud with itself, and had designs for obscuring its own lustre; for you no sooner have found an instance which you may be apt to apprehend is the very *brightest impudence*, than instantly another casts up twenty times more *splendid*, and before you have got through them all, you are at a loss again, and you cannot tell him which was the most surprizing. But I shall only give a specimen of this *virtue*, as I have done of the rest.

1. Then the blot of *impudence* might have been charged upon him though he had said no more than what he has said concerning the *Prelatical scribblers* (Preface to First Vindication), viz. " That they used a piece of cunning in spreading their books in England only, where the things contained in them could not be known nor examined, but there was never one of them to be found in a bookseller's shop in Scotland, where most readers could have discovered the falsehood of their allegations." And his brother, Mr Meldrum, in his Letter subjoined to G[ilbert] R[ule]'s " Second Vindication," insists on the same *ingenious speculation*. And yet both of them could not but know very well that these Prelatic scribblers might have attempted to have pulled a star from the firmament as plausibly, as to have got anything that made against the Presbyterians printed in Scotland. One thing I can assure G[ilbert] R[ule] of. His

"True Representation of Presbyterian Government" had not seen the light many days, when a licence was sought for publishing an answer to it, but it could not be obtained; and how many innocent pamphlets have been seized by the Government since the beginning of the late Revolution? Did not both these gentlemen know this sufficiently? And was it not *impudence* in them, especially in G[ilbert] R[ule], considering the *post* he had, to publish such a calumny, as that it was the *conscience* of the falsehoods [which] were in them that made his adversaries publish their books in England?

2. Another instance of his *impudence* might be his so frequent insisting on the *loyalty* of his party. Believe him, and no men can be more *loyal* than Scottish Presbyterians. "Nothing but malice can make any think that Presbytery is an enemy to monarchy. (First Vindication ad Question 2, § 2). Our obedience to magistrates in all their lawful commands, and our peaceful sufferings of unjust violence are notour to all that can behold us with an unprejudiced eye. (True Report ad Observation 1). None maintain more loyal principles towards Kings than Presbyterians do. (Ibid. ad Observation 2). They always abhorred rebellion. (Second Vindication, p. 63). Yea, it is manifest it is not their principle to bargain with their Kings about allegiance. (Ibid. p. 99). Our principles are known that we owe loyalty, and have payed it, even to an idolatrous King," i. e. K[ing] J[ames]. (Ibid. p. 115). Who can deny now that Presbyterians are true *passive obedience* and *non-resistance men?* Or rather, who knows not that this is bantering the *common sense* of all Britain?

3. There is no less *impudence* in the large *encomiums* he makes on the *harmlessness* and *innocence* of his party. It is true, and it is much, he acknowledges sometimes—"They are men, they have infirmities, they have been guilty of excesses," &c. But try him to the bottom, and you shall never find him descending below these generals; you shall not find him acknowledging that any particular instance, wherein they *exceeded*, was not very *excusable*. Thus he cannot endure to hear that they were ever *persecutors* or *rebels*.

Not *persecutors*, for if they had been persecutors, it is not to be doubted that the *Prelatists* had felt it. But what have they ever felt? Hear him in his Preface to "First Vindication"

—"It may be thought strange that the men with whom we have to do should make such tragical outcries about their sufferings, when it may be made appear, that in the late times, when Presbyterians suffered from their hands, any one of many, who may be instanced, suffered more hardships and barbarous cruelty than all of them have endured." I must confess, these men who suffered so have suffered to purpose, for I think it was pretty severe for *one man* to suffer the deprivation of 500 or 600 livelihoods and have 500 or 600 families, perchance 4000 or 5000 persons, to maintain on nothing. I know not how far our Author's skill in Algebra may reach, but I think in this he was hard enough for *common sense*. But this is not all.

Hear him again in that same "Vindication," (ad Question 3. § 1.)—"All unbiassed men who know, and have observed the way of the one and the other, while they alternatively had the ascendant, will say that the little finger of the meanest Prelate and his underlings was heavier than the loins of the greatest Assembly of the Presbyterian Church." What, Sir? No, not the Assembly 1645,[1] nor

[1] [This Assembly ratified and approved the "Solemn League and Covenant," the intolerance of which is too well known to require further notice here. The other Assemblies named in this place were held during the Covenanting "Reign of Terror," and are characterized for the severity of their enactments, and the utter disregard evinced by them towards the conscientious scruples of those whom they were pleased to call *Malignants*. The Parliament which met on the 19th April 1648 had issued a "Declaration" of a healing or remedial nature, but this was opposed by the Commission of the Assembly in the most virulent manner. They refused to exert themselves to have the King (Charles I., who was in the hands of English rebels) set at liberty, unless "he did first subscrive and swear to both Covenants." They insisted also that there should be no communication with *Malignants* in any of the three kingdoms, and that those who refused to swear to certain articles of their own enacting should be "*incapable of any office, civil or ecclesiastical, and should forfeit their estates.*" Besides, they drew up a counter declaration to that of the Parliament, which they transmitted to the several Presbyteries, and ordered ministers to read it from their pulpit, "*threatening all with excommunication and divine wrath who should enrol under the standard of the King and Scottish Parliament.*" When the Assembly met in the same year, it approved of *all* the proceedings of its Commission, and of course *this* amongst the rest, and "superadded a variety of injunctions, couched in terms of defiance to the supreme authority of the State." As it respects this Act of the Commission a Presbyterian writer has remarked—"A more monstrous instance of usurpation is no where to be found in the past history of the Reformed Church." Records of the Kirk of Scotland, by Alexander

1648, nor 1649, excepted? And "Second Vindication," p. 23 —"The sufferings of the Prelatists are but flea-bites in comparison of the bloody lashes that others suffered." And, p. 45, "Their sufferings are but scratches of pins," &c. And you know even the tenderest *nurses*, such as our Presbyterians are to Prelatists, cannot constantly preserve their dearest *nurselings* from such accidents. Who can say now that ever Presbyterians were *persecutors?*

Believe him and they were as little *rebels*. "Episcopacy indeed raised a tumult in K[ing] C[harles] I's time, which ended in its own ruin." (First Vindication ad Question 2. § 3). And yet in answer to that same Question, § 5— "It is true they (the Prelatists) raised no tumults." For if there is a difference between raising tumults, and raising no tumults, yet it is certain that they are only *abstracts* which *raise* them and *concretes* do *not raise* them. Well! were the *concretes*, the Episcopalians, innocent of *tumultuating?*

Peterkin, Esq. 1838, p. 494, 530-1, from which references the substance of this note is chiefly extracted. What has been well styled the *Covenanting Reign of Terror*, which includes the years here referred to by Bishop Sage, is thus described in Lochiel's Memoirs—"We are told of this most cruel *tyranny* that ever scourged and affected the sons of men. Such as they (the Presbyterian preachers) were pleased to call *Malignants*, were taxed and pillaged at discretion; and if they chanced to prove the least refractory, or deficient in payment, their persons or estates were seized. The Committee of the Kirk sat at the helm, and were supported by a small number of fanatical (persons) and others, who called themselves the "Committee of the Estates," but were chiefly nothing else but the barbarous executioners of their (the Presbyterian) wrath and vengeance. Every parish had a (preaching) tyrant, who made the greatest lord in the district stoop to his authority. The kirk was the place where he kept his court, the pulpit his throne or tribunal, from whence he issued out his terrible decrees, and twelve or fourteen sour ignorant enthusiasts, under the title of *Elders*, composed his council. If any, of what quality soever, had the assurance to disobey his edicts, the dreadful sentence of excommunication was immediately thundered out against him, his goods and chattels confiscated and seized; and himself being looked upon as actually in possession of the devil, and irretrievably doomed to eternal perdition, all that conversed with him were in no better esteem." If to this we add the testimony of the Presbyterian Mr Scott, in his Notes to the MS. Hospital Registers of Perth, that "the Commission of the General Assembly was at that time perhaps the most formidable court that had ever existed in this country," and had "taken away all exercise of private judgment," we shall not require further proof of our author's allusion, and of the "pin-scratches" of Presbytery in the palmy days of the *glorious Covenant*.—E.]

Consider what follows—" They did what they could to raise a war for continuing on the necks of the people that yoke that they had wreathed on them, and did effectually draw on a bloody war," &c. But what did the Presbyterians on that occasion? Why, how far were they from being *rebels?* For thus saith our author (Second Vindication, p. 140)—" These things "—whatever the Presbyterians did—" were done by the body of the nation met in the most orderly representative that the time and case could permit, and I deny not that they were EXTRAORDINARY ACTINGS." Nothing in these times like *perjury*, or *treachery*, or *treason*, or *rebellion*, committed by Presbyterians, you see! All were " EXTRAORDINARY ACTINGS!" In short, Presbyterians " are beyond reproaches in the consciences of all that know them, and do not hate them" (Second Vindication, p. 37).

Now, it was none of my designs to render the Presbyterians peculiarly odious by adducing these instances. I know these crimes are not peculiar to them. I doubt not many of them are not violently inclined to persecution or rebellion. I doubt as little many of them will be ready to acknowledge they are *peaceable* as other men, and things have been done by many of their party which such as are *ingenuous* will not offer to *apologize* for. That which I was mainly concerned for was our author's *impudence;* for who ever saw greater impudence than there is in these ridiculous defences he has been pleased to publish in vindication of his party?

4. Another instance might be his making his party so frequently the *only Protestants* in the nation—the only men that *resisted*, or *could resist*, or were *willing* to *resist*, *Popery*. Thus, the author of the " Ten Questions " had said, and said truly, that " the Presbyterians accepted and gave thanks for an Indulgence, notwithstanding that they knew that all the designs of the Court were for advancing Popery." How our author justifies their thankful addressing to K[ing] J[ames] for such a favour shall be considered by and bye. That which I take notice of at present is his apology for their accepting of that Indulgence. " It had been a strange thing," says he, First Vindication, ad Question 8, § 2, " if they should have been backward to preach and hear the gospel when a door was opened for it, because some men had a design against the gospel in their opening of it."—

(The gospel, you know, was neither preached nor heard in Scotland before a door was opened for it by that Indulgence; but this by the way).—"Surely their silence and peevish refusing on that occasion had been much to the hurt of the gospel; for then Papists, who would not fail to use the liberty for their part, should have had the fairest occasion imaginable to mislead people without *any to oppose them*. On the contrary, their using that liberty was the great mean by which, with the blessing of the Lord, so very few, during that time of liberty, were perverted to Popery in the nation." Now, who should doubt, after this, that all the *Prelatists* were silent encouragers of *Popery*, and that the Presbyterians were the only people who preached against it zealously, and opposed it boldly? Here is such a master-piece of our author's main talent, as I am confident no other Presbyterian in the nation will offer to extenuate, far less justify. He insists on the same theme in his "Second Vindication," p. 91, where he tells that "wise men thought that the best way to keep out Popery was to make use of the liberty for setting the people in the right way," &c.; as if there had been no possibility of keeping them from turning *Papists*, but by making them *Presbyterians!*

5. Near of kin to this is that other common head he sometimes insists on, viz. that all are Papists, or *Popishly affected*, who were not for the late Revolution. Thus, in his "First Vindication," ad Question 9, § 4, in answer to that allegation that the Presbyterians denied the King's prerogative of making peace and war, &c. he tells the world—"If this his argument can cast any blame on Presbyterians, it is this, that there are cases in which they allow the States and body of the nation to resist the King so far, as to hinder him to root out the religion that is by law established among them, and one should think that he might have been by this time convinced that this is not peculiar to Presbyterians, but that all the Protestants in Britain are engaged in the same thing." And in his "True Representation" (ad Objection 2), he has these plain words—"What was done"—(in removing K[ing] J[ames] from his throne)—"was not by us alone, but by all the *true Protestants*[1] in the nation, who were indeed

[1] [The clause within brackets is omitted in the reprint of the work referred to. It had most likely given offence, for it is well known that

concerned for the safety of that holy religion." Now, it is none of my present business to justify or apologize for such as were or are against the late Revolution. Let Jacobitism be as great an heresy as our author pleases to call it. Let him rank it with *Platonism* or *Socinianism* if he will; only I dare be bold to say that it was an odd stretch of *impudence* to make it *Popery*. I mentioned a little above his apologizing for his party's *addressing* so thankfully to K[ing] J[ames] for his *Toleration;* and truly his performances that way may pass.

6. For another instance of his having a good *dose* of *brow*, as himself commonly calls his own *prime accomplishment*. For it was such an arrant mixture[1] of flattery and hypocrisy, especially when enlightened by their subsequent practice, that no sophistry can palliate it so as to make it seem innocent; but it has been so frequently tossed already that I need not to insist upon it. Far less am I at leisure to examine all the ridiculous stuff our author has vented about it. Only one thing I shall propose to the world to be farther considered.

Whoso has read any of our author's "Vindications" of his Church of "Scotland," cannot but have observed that, even to loathsomeness, he was precise in pursuing his adversaries foot for foot, on all occasions when *impudence* itself could afford him any thing to say; yet one thing of very great consequence was alleged by the author of the "Second Letter," to which he has answered nothing. What else could move our author to this *sinful* and unseasonable *silence*, but the *conscience* that it was not fit to meddle with it? The matter is this. "The author of that Letter, having discoursed how amazed the Presbyterians themselves were at the *dispensing power*, upon the publication of K[ing] J[ames]'s first Proclamation for the Toleration, how little forward they were at first to accept of it, and how they complied not with its designs till they got a second edition of it, &c. offered at conjecturing about the reasons which might have induced them afterwards to embrace it so thankfully and unanimously as they did. Amongst the rest I find he

many Presbyterians were loyal to King James, and on that account the author probably considered it prudent to omit the paragraph altogether.—E.]

[1] *Vide* note *infra* page 65.

insisted on *this* as *one*, viz. that "they had got secret instructions from *Holland* to comply with the dispensing power in subserviency to the ensuing Revolution;" and he added, that for this "he knew there were very strong presumptions." Now, G[ilbert] R[ule], I say, passed this over in a profound silence, which to me seems a considerable presumption that there was some truth in the matter, and the *Epistler* had guessed right. But if it was so, I think the Presbyterian Addresses to K[ing] J[ames] for the Toleration may now appear in blacker colours than ever.

I am earnest not to be mistaken. I do not condemn their keeping a correspondence with the Court at the Hague on that occasion, let that have been done dutifully or undutifully as it might. All I am concerned for is this, that if they kept a correspondence there at that time—if they got encouragement or advice thence to comply with the Toleration—if they were instructed to comply with it in subserviency to the ensuing Revolution—if these things were, I say, then, what a *villany* was it in them to address K[ing] J[ames] in such a manner? If they had known nothing of any designs for setting him beside his throne—if they had been privy to no intrigues against him—if it had been nothing but a *surprize* occasioned by such an unexpected liberty that prevailed with them to address to him in such terms as they did on that occasion, something might have been pleaded to extenuate their guilt, at least, though they had complied with the designs of the Revolution afterwards, when they saw it prevailing. Their ignorance of intrigues and the politic designs [which] were then on foot, and the possibility of their having been sincere when they addressed so to him, might have been pleaded in alleviation of the *dishonesty* of their not performing what they promised in their Address; and it might have passed on with the common crowd of infirmities which usually surprize men of weak resolution in such critical junctures. But to be in plots and intrigues against him—to snatch at his concessions that they might be in a condition to ruin him, and in the meantime to make such protestations to him—to flatter and cajole him at such a rate, merely of design to wheedle him into a deep security, that they might the more expeditely and effectually supplant and ruin him, was such an instance of

iniquity, of antichristian craft, of rank and vile cheatery, as can scarce be paralleled in history; and so I leave it.

Thus I have given half a dozen of instances which might be sufficient, in all reason, for exposing our author's goodly *impudence*, and yet they may be reckoned amongst the most innocent of many scores that might be collected in his writings. But it is not my present purpose to pursue him in all his wild careers. I shall, therefore, insist only on three or four things more, which, as I take it, may be sufficient to give the world a surfeit of him. The things I am to take notice of are some *impudent shifts* he has betaken himself to for extricating himself, when at any time *he* or *his cause* was put to it, by any present difficulty. In such cases no rule obliges him, no law binds him, no equity bounds him, no shame bridles him, no sense of reputation overawes him. Thus, e. g.

7. Before he shall be forced to yield in his argument, or seem to be *nonplussed*, he shall not fail to *furbish* his *talent*, and make it keen enough for combating the common sense of the whole nation. It were an endless work to trace him through all instances he has of this nature. "What possessions have any"—of the Episcopal clergy—"been deprived of, unless for crimes against the State?" Second Vindication, p. 6. Now, who knows not that more than three hundred who were *outed* by the rabble were *deprived* of their possessions, and that by an Act of Parliament, without so much as being *charged* with any *crime*, or *tried* by any *Court?* Again, the author of the "Second Letter" had called it *K[ing] J[ames]'s retirement*, when he left England and went to France—"so he termeth" —says G[ilbert] R[ule], Second Vindication, p. 23—"that which the Parliament called King James' abdicating the government." Now, his author was a *Scottish* man, and writing upon *Scottish hypotheses*, and about *Scottish* affairs, so that if G[ilbert] R[ule] spake *sense*, he spake of the *Scottish* Parliament. But I am satisfied that the world reckon me as impudent as G[ilbert] R[ule] is really, if there is so much as one syllable, or any thing that looks like an intimation of King J[ames]'s either *abdicating* or *deserting* the Government in any *Scottish* Declaration, or Law, or Claim of Right, in any *public deed* done by the nation. Again, "Second Vindication," p. 36, he says, that "most of them who were thrust

out by the rabble were put out by their own consciences." But after this, what might he not have said? To trace him through all such instances, I say, would be an endless work. I shall, therefore, confine myself to two—one a *matter of fact*, another a *matter of right*, or rather a *mixed matter*, in which both *right* and *fact* are concerned.

The *matter of fact* shall be that story he so frequently insists on about my Lord Dundee's 2000 men, &c. in his "Second Vindication."—"About the time the Convention of Estates was to sit down, a design was discovered, framed by the Viscount of Dundee and others, to surprize and seize the Convention; and for this end had secretly got together of K[ing] J[ames]'s disbanded soldiers and others about 2000 strangers in Edinburgh" (p. 11). This plot did our author a great many services. "It occasioned those of the West to gather as many into Edinburgh to oppose them, and secure the Convention" (Ibid.) Mark here—they were those of the West who *gathered* the rabble into Edinburgh, and this *gathering* was only *occasional*, and of their own proper motion. Mark these things, I say, and compare them with what follows. Again, that "there was a design to fall on the ministers of Edinburgh is affirmed on no ground, and without any truth, or that the College of Justice armed in their defence. It was rather on the same design on which the Viscount of Dundee had gathered forces into the town, and it was for opposing of them, and not for assaulting the ministers of Edinburgh" (Ibid. 39.) And (p. 40)—"The thanks the rabble got was for their zeal in defending the Convention from that opposite rabble, viz. the 2000 men Dundee and others had gathered into Edinburgh to have seized the Convention." Again, (p. 96)—"That the Western rabble which came to Edinburgh in the time of the Convention were in arms against law," says he, "is false, for they were called by the authority of the Estates as their guard, when their enemies had gathered a formidable party into Edinburgh; and though they were together before the Earl of Leven got the command, yet not before they were called together by the Estates," (Ibid.) And (p. 110)—"He (Dundee) had gathered a formidable party to destroy the Convention of Estates, and they gathered a force for their own security." Now, one

who is a mere stranger to Scottish affairs, finding this plot of Dundee's so confidently asserted, so frequently insisted on, made use of to serve so many turns, would seem to have reason to believe that there was really such a *plot*, and that all this was uncontrovertible *matter of fact*. For how is it to be imagined that *one* who undertook to be the "Vindicator" of the kingdom of Scotland should talk so *boldly* of such a *recent* matter of fact, if there was no such thing *really?* And yet the whole nation knows this whole matter is as *notorious* [a] *figment*,[1] as *arrant poesy*, as is in all Homer, or Ovid's Metamorphoses. For my part, I never so much as once heard of it, and I was at Edinburgh for the most part [of] the whole year 1689, till I found it asserted by G[ilbert] R[ule] in his "Second Vindication," i. e. toward the end of the year 1691; and let the world judge of its credibility. Poets themselves should be careful to *feign* things *plausibly*, but it seems our author has never read so much as the first ten lines of Horace—"De Arte Poeticâ."

That convocation of the rabble from the West which was at Edinburgh when the Convention of Estates met would not have amounted to above 600 or 700 men. I saw them actually drawn up between the Tolbooth and the Weigh-House of Edinburgh[2] upon the 18th day of March 1689. I am confident they were not 800, yet though they were but a rabble, *raw* and *untrained* men, they chased Dundee out of Edinburgh, though he had 2000 *trained* and *disciplined* men under his command; and yet the same Dundee, with scarce 2000 *untrained*, *undisciplined* Highlanders, routed near to 4000 *trained* and *disciplined* men at Killiecrankie.[3]

[1] [It is expressly declared by contemporary writers that there was a Covenanting plot to murder Dundee, who, being made aware of it, withdrew from the Convention for his own personal security.—Lochiell's Memoirs, 4to. 1842, p. 235. Letter I. pp. 3, 4.—E.]

[2] [This is that part of the High Street of Edinburgh near the Castle known as the Lawnmarket. The Tolbooth, a most hideous prison, celebrated by Sir Walter Scott in the "Heart of Mid-Lothian," stood nearly in the centre of the street, at the north-west corner of St Giles' cathedral. It was removed in 1817. The Weigh-House, an ugly edifice, was erected in the middle of the street at the Castle Hill, near the site of the elegant edifice finished in 1844 for the meetings of the Established Presbyterian General Assembly. The Weigh-House was taken down in 1822.—E.]

[3] [It is only fair to add, however, that the Viscount of Dundee, who was killed at that battle, was indebted for his victory as much to the

But this is not all. You may observe, he says, it was not to defend the ministers of Edinburgh that the College of Justice armed, but in pursuance of that same design with Dundee, viz. the surprizing and seizing of the Convention. Now, *be it known to all men*, that the convocation of the rabble which occasioned the arming of the College of Justice was quite different from that convocation which was made when the Estates met. The Western rabble met first at Edinburgh with a design to have insulted the ministers of that city[1] about the 24th of January, and their numbers were daily increasing. The College of Justice[2] armed and kept guard about the 25th or 26th of that month. About the middle of February there was a proclamation over the Cross of Edinburgh, "commanding all in arms, except the garrisons, &c. to disband." Upon this the College of Justice disarmed immediately. All this while Dundee was so far from having got together 2000 to surprize the Convention, that neither was the Convention so much as indicted ;[3] for the letters by which it was indicted bear date no sooner than February 5, at St. James's, and some six, or eight, or ten days, I think, were gone before they were delivered to all persons concerned in Scotland. Nor was Dundee as yet come from England to Scotland.

Well ! was not the Western rabble, which was in Edinburgh in the time of the Convention, called by the Meeting of Estates for counterplotting Dundee's plot ? *Pure poesy* still ! For did not our author himself say (p. 11), that " Dundee's having got together 2000 men, &c. occasioned

nature of the ground as to the bravery of his Highlanders. This must be obvious to any one who has visited the battle field of Killicrankie—one of the wildest Passes anywhere to be seen. No troops, however numerous, disciplined, or well ordered, could act on such ground. It ought also to be remembered that General Mackay, who commanded King William's forces, was an officer of the most undoubted ability, courage, and experience.—E.]

[1] [The reader will of course understand that, in all these allusions to the " ministers of Edinburgh," the Episcopal clergy are meant.—E.]

[2] [This body consists of certain persons belonging to the legal profession, or connected with the Courts of Law in Scotland. On several occasions of danger its members have volunteered their services, been formed into a regiment for the protection of the public peace, and always distinguished for their loyalty and bravery.— E.]

[3] [Summoned to meet.—E.]

those in the West to gather as many into Edinburgh to oppose him." Now, if they were only occasionally *gathered* by those in the West, how could they be *called* by the authority of the Estates. Were those in the West, who gathered them, the *Estates?* Besides, I would only ask G[ilbert] R[ule] if he can as readily produce the *order* of the Estates for *levying* these men for defending the Convention against Dundee, as I can produce their Act for returning thanks to them? Let him search all the Records, and try if he can find such an *order*. In short, who knows not that that rabble was in Edinburgh as *early* as the *Estates* themselves? The Estates, as all Britain knows, met on the 14th day of March.[1] The rabble threatened Dundee on the 15th or 16th. He represented it to the Estates on Monday morning, being the 18th. He could find no security for his person. He departed, therefore, from Edinburgh with some 28 or 30 persons in his retinue that same day, and never saw it again.[2] All this was done before Leven got his commis-

[1] [Acta Parl. Scot. vol. ix. p. 5.—E.]

[2] [All this is historically correct. Dundee publicly announced to the Estates that the Cameronian Presbyterians from the western counties had formed a combination to murder him, and when we recollect the hatred they cherished to him, and their bitter ferocity, which they never attempted to conceal, when he was simply Colonel Graham of Claverhouse, we cannot doubt the fact. The Estates would offer him no security. The Viscount of Dundee then told them that for his safety he must leave Edinburgh. He did so at the head of about 30, but others say 60, troopers. His route of departure was down the steep alley from the east end of the High Street and the head or west end of the Canongate known as Leith Wynd. He then turned to the left, and rode slowly along the present line of Prince's Street, at that time a tract of grass land on the north side of the North Loch, and the pathway designated the *Lang Raw* or *Gate*. When at the west end of this pathway, near where St John's Episcopal Chapel is now erected, he ordered his men to halt, and he climbed up the west side of the castle rock, to hold a communication with the Duke of Gordon, the Governor of Edinburgh Castle, who commanded the fortress for King James, and who had observed Dundee's movements from the walls. The Viscount met the Duke at the Postern Gate, which has long disappeared. It is now ascertained that Dundee earnestly entreated the Duke to retain the fortress till reinforcements were sent to him from the Highlands. The Viscount then descended, mounted his steed, and rode off with his troopers to Linlithgow, whence he proceeded to the Highlands, and raised the Clans. This singular interview was witnessed by thousands with varied feelings. The Convention sent an officer named Bontine after Dundee, to compel him to return. Bontine overtook the Viscount on the road to Linlithgow, and it is need-

sion from the Estates to *command* the *rabble*, or *form* them into *regular troops*. Besides, let the world consider if it required not even *poetic expedition* to have got that rabble *levied* by *order* of the *meeting* of the *Estates*. There could not be an *order* of the Estates for *levying* them before the Estates met, as I take it. The Estates met on Thursday 14th, afternoon; on Monday the 18th, these men were in *rank* and *file* on the street of Edinburgh, and many, most of them, lived at fifty, sixty, seventy miles distance from the city. This, one would think, was no ordinary *expedition*. And now let any man judge if G[ilbert] Rule] was not inspired with a goodly dose of *poetic*—(*fire*, shall I call it, or)—*fury*, when he laid this foundation of Dundee's *plot*, and raised so many pretty structures upon it. And so much of his modesty in narrating matter of *mere fact*. But is he as modest at *mixed matters*, where both *right* and *fact* are concerned? Consider him but in *one* instance for brevity.

The author of the "Second Letter" had given an account of Dr Strachan's Defence,[1] when he appeared before the Committee of Estates, and was challenged for not praying for W[illiam] and M[ary] as K[ing] and Q[ueen] of Scotland, &c. This, for substance—"That the Estates had found, in their Claim of Right, that none could be K[ing] and Q[ueen] of Scotland till they had sworn the *Coronation Oath:* For this reason they had declared that *James*, by assuming the regal power, and acting as King, without having taken the *Oath* required by *Law*, had forfeited the *right* to the *Crown:* That all the Estates had yet done was only the nomination of W[illiam] and M[ary] as the persons to whom the *Crown* should be *offered;* but they had

less to observe that the order was disregarded. Dundee plainly told Bontine that if he attempted any violence, he would be sent back to the Convention *chopped to pieces in a blanket*. He fell soon after at the Pass of Killiecrankie, in defence of "King James and the Church of Scotland," which words were the war-cry of this illustrious Scotsman. For a minute account of the Viscount of Dundee's departure from Edinburgh, and the proceedings it occasioned, see "History of the Scottish Episcopal Church from the Revolution to the Present Time," by John Parker Lawson, M.A. Edinburgh, 8vo. 1843, p. 93-5.—E.]

[1] [This learned and pious person was Professor of Divinity in the University of Edinburgh, and one of the ministers of the Tron Church. —E.]

not yet actually made the *offer*, far less had W[illiam] and M[ary] accepted of it. It was possible they might refuse it, but though they should not, yet they could not be King and Queen of Scotland till they had solemnly sworn the *Oath*. This was not yet done, and therefore he could not see how he could pray for them as King and Queen of Scotland, nor how the Estates in reason, or in consequence to their own principles, could require it of him." One would think there was some force in this Defence, yet our author had such a *force* of *impudence*, as prompted him to offer at confuting it. But how? "It is known," says he, "that the exercise of the Government had been long before tendered to the Prince, and that his Highness had accepted and exercised it." True; it was tendered to him on the *tenth* of *January* 1688-9, and he accepted of it upon the *fourteenth*. But what was this to Mary? Was the exercise of the Government tendered to *her* also? Or did this *tender* made to William, and his accepting of it, make him *King?* Was he *King* even after the 14*th of January?*

Observe here, by the way, when our author had the rabble to defend, and the Estates to justify for not restoring the rabbled ministers, and the nation knows hundreds were rabbled after that 14th of January, he could tell it twenty times over that that was an *interregnum*, a *state of anarchy*, &c. So that, if I mistake not, it may try his *reconciling skill* to make what he says here, and what he said on these occasions, piece well together. Proceed we now to what he has said more about Strachan's Defence.

"The nation's representative," says he, "had then owned him (William) as their King, and therefore it was a contempt of the authority of the nation for any man to refuse to own him when called to do so." Now, what could move our author to such a *stretch* of his *main talent*, as thus to say that the representative of the nation had owned him as their *King?* I confess I am not able to fathom. For how could they own him as *King* so long as he had not taken the *Oath*, nor agreed to the *Claim of Right?* If they owned him as *King* before that, was he not *King* before that? But if he was *King* before that, where is the *use* of the *Oath*, or the *Claim of Right?*

The Estates, indeed, upon the 11*th of April* declared

W[illiam] and M[ary] to be the persons to whom they had resolved to *offer* the Crown, upon such and such *conditions*, as is evident from that day's *Proclamation*;[1] but the *Letter* of the Estates, by which they actually made the *offer* of the *Crown* on these *conditions*, was not written till *April* 24*th*, and the return, bearing that *they* had *accepted* of the Crown on these *conditions*, is dated *May* 17*th*. And was not Doctor Strachan deprived even before the Letter of the Estates was sent to London? Were not more than twenty-four ministers deprived before their Majesties' return came to Edinburgh? Besides, G[ilbert] R[ule]'s *impudence*, as *sturdy* as it is, did not serve him, it seems, to give a faithful account of Doctor Strachan's Defence, and grapple with all the force of it. For the Doctor, if the author of the "Second Letter" was right, made the supposition that William and Mary might refuse to take the Crown with such conditions. This was so far from being an impossible, that it was truly a very reasonable, a very equitable, a very dutiful supposition. Now, suppose they had done so, would they have been *King* and *Queen* for all that, by virtue of the Declaration of the Estates of the 11*th of April?* If so, I ask again what the *Coronation Oath*, or the *Claim of Right*, signified? Or were the Estates to make them *King* and *Queen* whether they would or not? If, upon that supposition, they had not been King and Queen, as undoubtedly they had not been, then what can be more evident than that the Proclamation of the 11th of April did no more than *nominate* them to be *King* and *Queen*, upon their *agreeing* to such *conditions?* So that G[ilbert] R[ule] was even himself, when he said that the nation's representative had *owned* them as *King* and *Queen* before the 13*th of April*.

I add farther—What though they had *owned* them as *King* and *Queen* by their Proclamation of the 11th of April? Did not the whole *drift*, the whole *design*, the whole *train*, the whole *tendency*, the whole *aspect*, and the whole *circumstances* of the deliberations, resolutions, and conclusions, of the Estates evidently propose it to the dullest apprehension, that the Crown was not to be granted to them but on such and such *conditions?* This question I propose for vindicat-

[1] [Acta Parl. Scot. vol. ix. p. 38, 40, 41.—E.]

ing Doctor Strachan from the guilt of *contempt* of the *authority* of the Estates, with which G[ilbert] R[ule] charges him. For if the affirmative in the question be *true*—and, I think G[ilbert] R[ule] himself dares not to say it is *false*—then, I ask, how it could be called a *contempt* of the *authority* of the nation to have refused then to *own*, W[illiam] and M[ary] as King and Queen? How can he be said to contemn the authority of the nation who reasons upon the nation's authority?—who *reasons* upon the *force* of all the deliberations, resolutions, and conclusions, of the representative body of the nation? If, doing so, he doth yet contemn the authority of the nation, I am apt to think it cannot be his fault. He doth but what a man must *needs do* when the nation makes *repugnant* and *contradictory determinations*. But, after all, is it not pleasant that G[ilbert] R[ule], forsooth, should so zealously exaggerate the *crime* of *contemning* the *authority* of the nation? Good man! He paid it a wonderful *dutifulness* all his life! Far was it still from him to treat it with such *contempt* as Doctor Strachan's amounted to!

But he has not yet done. He answers further, that it is a "material mistake of the words of the *Claim of Right*"—(that was alleged in Strachan's Defence)—"which doth not say, none can be King or Queen;" but that "none can exercise the regal power till they have taken the Coronation Oath. It is certain that on the death of a King his rightful successor is King, and may be prayed for as such; and such praying may be enjoined even before taking of the Oath. The same may be said of *one chosen*, and proclaimed by the supreme authority of the nation, which is the case now in hand."

Here is a piece of as odd stuff as one would wish to see; for if it was a *material mistake* to say "none can be King or Queen," when it should have been said, "none can exercise the regal power," it seems to me to have been a *mistake* made of very *mathematical matter*, not of the solid sensible *matter*, which can be *felt* and *handled*. For my part, I cannot forbear thinking it must be compounded of negative quantities till I shall learn how one can be a *King*, i. e. a person who has right to rule and act as King, who has yet *no right to exercise the regal power, or act as King*. I know one may be physically incapable of exercising the regal power, and acting

as King by himself, in several cases, such as that of infancy, &c.; yet even then he has *right* which is not a *physical* but a *moral* quality. Now, I say, I would fain understand how one can be a *King* without this *moral quality*, or how he can have this *moral quality* called right, and yet be *morally* incapable of exercising it. I shall own G[ilbert] R[ule] is good at metaphysics if he can give an intelligible account of these things.

Well! But it is certain "that on the death of a King his rightful successor is King, and may be prayed for as such; and such praying may be enjoined even before taking of the Oath." All this is true; but then I affirm it is as true that that "rightful successor" who is "King" may and can exercise the regal power, and act as King, before he takes the Oath. So, I am sure, our Scottish monarchs have *done*, so the Law allows them to *do*, so of necessity they *must do*. For instance, they are not bound by Law to take the Oath but at their Coronation. And, not to speak of other things, I think it is truly an exercising of their regal power, and acting as *Kings*, to appoint the preparations for, the day, the place, the solemnities, &c. of, their own Coronations; for, I think, none other can do it but *the King*, and if so he must do it *as King*, otherwise *another* might do it.

But then, though I have granted our author this much, that the "rightful successor" is "King" before he takes the Oath, I think no reason can oblige me to grant what follows, viz. that "the same may be said of ONE CHOSEN and proclaimed by the supreme authority of the nation, which is the CASE NOW IN HAND." For, not to insist on the liberty our author hath taken here to call their Majesties *elective sovereigns*, in opposition to such as are *hereditary*, though I think it was pretty bold in him to talk so, I think this is one of the most notable differences between an *hereditary* and an *elective* monarchy, that in the hereditary *the King never dies*, i. e. in that same instant that the regnant King's breath goeth out, the rightful successor is King; whereas in the elective monarchy the *King dies* with the *man*, and there is no King till there is a *new creation*. This, I think, makes the cases pretty wide, and I think they are *wider* yet, when he that is to be the *elected King* is not to be King *at all* till he agrees to such and such *conditions*.

Who sees not a vast difference between the *hereditary* and the *elective* King in this case? But not to press our author farther, and once for all to end this controversy about Strachan's Defence, take what follows for undoubted truth.

Upon that same very 11th of April 1689, on which the Estates gave out their Proclamation, importing that they had *resolved* that William and Mary should be King and Queen of Scotland, they enacted their Declaration, containing the Claim of Right, and their *resolution* to *offer* the Crown only on the *terms* of that Claim; and not only so, but they made this following Act word for word.

"Forasmuch as the Estates of this Kingdom by their former Acts declare that they would continue undissolved until the Government, Laws, and Liberties of the Kingdom should be settled and secured; and they having now proceeded to *resolve* that William and Mary, King and Queen of England, be, and be *declared*, King and Queen of Scotland: And considering that the nation cannot be without Government until the said King and Queen of England accept the *offer* of the Crown according to the *Instrument of Government*, and take the *Oath* required before they enter to the exercise of the regal power, Therefore the said Estates do hereby *declare* and *enact*, that they will continue in the Government, as formerly, until their Majesties' *acceptance* of the Crown, and their *taking* of the said Oath be made known to them."[1]

If this Act doth not make it evident that there was no *material mistake* of the words of the Claim of Right in Doctor Strachan's Defence, but that the Doctor pleaded and reasoned upon the manifest principles of the Meeting of the Estates;—if it doth not demonstrate that the Doctor's plea was solid and irrefragable;—and if it follows not by necessary consequence that it was an unaccountable proceeding of the Committee of Estates to deprive the Doctor, and near to thirty more, for not praying for W[illiam] and M[ary,] as K[ing] and Q[ueen] of Scotland, before they *were*, or *could be*, K[ing] and Q[ueen] of Scotland—let the intelligent

[1] [See also Acta Parl. Scot. vol. ix. p. 41.—E.]

reader judge. But if these inferences are notoriously just, then let him judge again if G[ilbert] R[ule], by offering to invalidate the Doctor's Defence, was not guilty of a palpable indiscretion in refreshing the memory of such an unaccountable proceeding of the Meeting of the Committee of Estates, which had far better been buried in perpetual oblivion. And lastly, let him judge if it argued not more than an *ordinary impudence* in G[ilbert] R[ule] to have attempted the *defence* of that procedure; and if such an attempt was not, with a *fetch* of his *talent* peculiar to himself, to offer *violence* to reason and law, to justice and equity, to the light of nature, and to the common sense of mankind.

One would think it was *impudence* enough in all conscience to have made so bold with common humanity, and particularly with the universal convictions of one's native country as to a plain matter of fact. But such is our author's share of that *daring talent*, that, assisted by it, he could even flee in the face of his *dearer relations*, and leave them in the *lurch*, rather than appear to have been worsted in his arguments. Thus, *e. g.*

8. When he was put to it, and could not otherwise make his escape, he never made scruple to flee in the face of the present civil government.

He tells you, indeed, in his Preface to "Second Vindication," § 6, that one of his designs in writing his book was to vindicate and justify the actings of the civil government. Believe him, on many occasions, and he is a most dutiful subject; there cannot be a greater reverencer of authority. He tells you—"It is a saucy boldness for private persons to meddle with the designs of legislators" (Second Vindication, p. 112). And God knows how frequently he exposes his adversaries to the resentments of the civil government. How zealous is he for *stretching necks*, &c.! And yet, for all this, as much as he is obliged to it—as great a veneration as he pretends for it, it must not only shift for itself, but he must run through its sides, if he has not another hole to escape by. I shall only take notice of two instances of his behaviour this way.

The *first* is in his "Second Vindication," (p. 22). His adversary had laughed at the Presbyterian Address, and these protestations of *loyalty* to King James. "But I would

fain know," says G[ilbert] R[ule], "by what topic either of these can be condemned." I think I have hinted at least at *topic* enough about that. Go we on now with our author.—"They gave thanks for restoring them to their just right." Neither is this the matter. "They professed and practised loyalty towards their LAWFUL sovereign, though of a different religion from them." Here it is. For do not you hear him plainly affirming that K[ing] J[ames] was a LAWFUL SOVEREIGN? Now, what was this less than striking at the very root of the present Establishment? Is it not a direct contradicting of the Claim of Right, which *declares* that K[ing] J[ames] "had forfeited the right to the Crown, by assuming the regal power, and acting as King, without ever taking the Oath required by Law?" i. e. manifestly for not being a "LAWFUL SOVEREIGN." If thus to contradict its very foundation strikes not at the root of the present Constitution, let the world judge; but so it was, that our author could not otherwise justify the Presbyterian Address,[1] &c.

[1] [The History of the "*Dispensing Power*" and "*Address*," which are so frequently mentioned in the Preface, may thus be summed up:—James the Seventh had applied to the Scottish Parliament in 1686 for a repeal of the Penal Laws against Roman Catholics, and of the Tests, which qualified for certain offices and privileges. But failing in his application, he determined to gain his point by another way—by an absolute exercise of the Royal prerogative, rescinding all religious restrictions and tests. Accordingly, on the 12th February 1687, he issued a Proclamation granting a partial toleration to certain specified Dissenters in His ancient kingdom of Scotland. But this not completely answering the ends for which it was designed, on the 5th July he granted a second Indulgence, containing free toleration to all systems of religion. There can be no doubt that the Sovereign in this instance infringed upon the laws of the land; yet so overjoyed were the Presbyterians at the freedom held out to them, that, forgetful of their dislike to Popery and Papists,—for whose sake they well knew the change had been effected—they eagerly availed themselves of it, and went out of their way to testify their *gratitude*, by presenting an Address to the King—full of expressions of loyalty and flattery—which after-events, in which these same persons were chief actors, prove to have been mere hypocritical professions, which they did not feel, and to which they were determined not to adhere. The Address was as follows:—"To the King's Most Excellent Majesty, the humble Address of the Presbyterian Ministers in his Majesty's kingdom of Scotland. May it please your Majesty: We your Majesty's most loyal subjects, the Ministers of the Presbyterian persuasion in your ancient kingdom of Scotland, from the deep sense which we have of your Majesty's gracious and surprizing favour, in not only putting a stop to our long sad sufferings for Nonconformity, but granting us the liberty of the public and peaceable

Again—One of his adversaries argued that Episcopacy was abolished by the Parliament, as being contrary to the *inclinations of the people*, and, therefore, if the people should *alter their inclinations*, it might be *restored* by another Parliament. One would think there was reason here, and it seems G[ilbert] R[ule] was sensible of it; and, therefore, finding no other way to avoid its *dint*, he straight impugns the *power* of King and Parliament. Take his own words—("Second Vindication," p. 90)—"But he should have considered," says he, "that whatever motive the Estates went upon, it is declared against in the Claim of Right as a grievance, and therefore cannot be restored without overturning the foundation of our present civil settlement." He is at this again in other places upon the like occasions, particularly p. 152.

Now, not to insist on the *irreligion* and *godlessness* of that

exercise of our ministerial function without any hazard, as we bless the Great God, who hath put this in your Royal heart, do withal find ourselves bound in duty to offer our most humble and hearty thanks to your sacred Majesty, the favour bestowed being to us, and all the people of our persuasion, valuable above all our earthly comforts; Especially since we have ground from your Majesty to believe that our loyalty is not to be questioned on account of our being Presbyterians, who, as we have, under all former temptations, endeavoured, so are firmly resolved, still to preserve an entire loyalty in our doctrine and practice, (consonant to our known principles, which, according to the Holy Scriptures, are contained in the Confession of Faith, generally owned by Presbyterians in all your Majesty's dominions,) and by the help of God, so to demean ourselves, as your Majesty may find cause rather to enlarge than to diminish your favours towards us; thoroughly persuading ourselves, from your Majesty's justice and goodness, that if we shall, at any time be otherwise represented, your Majesty will not give credit to such information until you take due cognition thereof: And humbly beseeching that those who promote any disloyal principles and practices, as we do disown them, may be looked upon as none of ours, whatever name they may assume to themselves. May it please your most Excellent Majesty graciously to accept this our humble Address, as proceeding from the plainness and simplicity of loyal and thankful hearts, much engaged by this your royal favour, to continue our fervent prayers to the King of Kings for divine illumination and conduct, with all other blessings, spiritual and temporal, ever to attend your Royal Person and Government; which is the greatest duty can be rendered to your Majesty, by your Majesty's most humble, most faithful, and most obedient subjects. At Edinburgh, July 21, 1687." The reader will easily perceive, by a comparison of this Address with the subsequent conduct of the parties who framed it, that the terms here and in other places applied to it by Bishop Sage—see page 51—were not undeservedly severe.—E.]

wild fetch, viz.—That whatever the motives were which induced men to establish any thing, yet being once established it cannot be altered :—Not to insist on the notorious unreasonableness of separating the *conclusion* of the Estates from their *premises*, and saying the *conclusion* must stand though the *premises* be rejected, though they established the *conclusion* on the strength they apprehended was in the *premises* :—Not to insist on the ridiculousness of saying that Episcopacy cannot be restored without overturning the "foundation" of the "present civil settlement," though nothing can be more ridiculous than to say that the "foundations" of the "present civil settlement" are subverted, if all *ecclesiastical grievances* are not redressed :—Not to insist that our author spake very much at random when he called the *abolition* of Episcopacy one of the *fundamentals* of the present *civil* settlement, considering that the present *civil* settlement was not only *founded* but *finished* a good time before[1] the *abolition* of Episcopacy :—Not to insist on things, I say, however momentous, consider only how directly and plainly he impugns the power of King and Parliament by saying—"*They cannot restore Episcopacy without subverting the foundations of the present civil settlement.*" What is this less than that if *King* and *Parliament* should *restore* Episcopacy, they should break their *original contracts?* than that *both* should *forfeit* their titles—than that the King should be *no more King*, and the Parliament should be *no more Parliament?* Is it not clear, that with our author the Articles of our present Claim of Right are *unalterable*—unchangeable rules both to King and Parliament? Now, if this is not to impugn their *power*, I know not what can be. In effect, it is to evacuate the *usefulness* of all *sovereign power*. For where lieth its *usefulness*, if it is not able to rectify what is amiss even in the Constitution? But how can it rectify what is amiss in the Constitution, if the Constitution, right or wrong, is unalterable?

For my part, I cannot see but there *is* still that supreme power in the nation which *was*, when the present *civil* settlement was made ; and as it *might*, while it was a *making* settle-

[1] [William and Mary were proclaimed King and Queen on the 13th of March 1689, but the Church was not overthrown, and Presbyterianism established, until July 22.—E.]

ments, have *made* either *another* or the *same*, with twenty little varieties, so it may still *alter* that which is made. I cannot think that it either disabled or exhausted itself, so as to be no more capable of providing *farther* or *otherwise* for the good of the nation, when it shall find it necessary. In short, is not that same power still in the nation which established the Claim of Right? If it is not, what is become of it? How can the nation subsist without a *supra-legal*, *supra-original contract*, *supra Claim of Right Power?* It had it once, otherwise how could it ever have had *laws*, or *claims of right*, or *original contracts?* And must it not have it still? Has it lost it, or thrown it away? Or has any body taken it from it? But if it is still to the fore[1]—if the nation is still possessed of it, where is it lodged, if it is not lodged in King and Parliament? Was there more *power* in the Meeting of Estates than there is now in King and Parliament? How came the Meeting of Estates by it then, or whither is it *vanished* now? What is become of it? Especially, I think, it was pretty bold to say that the *same power* is not in the *present King* and the *present Parliament*, considering that the present Parliament is that same very individual thing with the Meeting of Estates by which the Claim of Right was created. Cannot the same, the very same *creators* pretend to a power of altering their own *ill-made creature*, and make it *better?* Had they more power under *one name* than under *another?* Or have they weakened or lost their power by communicating it to their King, so that there is not so much power now in *him* and *them* both together, as there was *once* in *them* singly?

And now let the reader judge if G[ilbert] R[ule], for avoiding a difficulty, has not impudently run himself into the guilt of the most atrocious, the most criminal, the most *treasonable treason*—the treason of impugning the power of King and Parliament. This was odd enough for one in his circumstances. But yet the next step seems to me a little more surprizing.

For, 9. On several occasions he has not stood on disgracing his own dear party, the Presbyterians themselves, and most undutifully as well as impudently discovering their

[1] [This query is peculiarly a Scotticism, meaning—*If it still exists.*—E.]

nakedness. I shall not insist on all instances that might be adduced to this purpose, particularly his loading the Cameronians with so much guilt, and so many hard names upon every turn. The *Cameronians*,[1] I say, these men of *plain* principles, these avowed *Covenanters*, these most orthodox and honest Presbyterians in the nation—even them, though they are the true Champions of the *Cause*, and were the principal promoters of the Presbyterian interest in the beginning of the late Revolution, he has lashed to purpose when his argument required it, as may be seen in every page almost of his "Second Vindication." But this I shall not insist on, I say; leaving him and them to reckon for it, if they shall think it fit.

I shall take notice only of one very tender *secret* of his own *anomalous species* of pretended Presbyterians, which he has even *needlessly*, and by consequence very *foolishly* and *undutifully*, exposed. He has in his books made many more inexcusable *officious lies*, than if he had made one for covering such a mighty *shame* of theirs; but it is hard for one of

[1] [So called from one Richard Cameron, who, from being a schoolmaster at Falkland (from which office he was deposed for insufficiency), turned field-preacher, and having gathered crowds around him, broke out into rebellion, and was slain in a skirmish at Aird's Moss, in Ayrshire, June 1680. His followers, after the death of Cameron, continued their rebellious proceedings, and though frequently slaughtered by the royal troops, always seemed to increase, actuated by redoubled fanaticism and obstinate resistance to constituted authority. After the Revolution they had ample opportunity of testifying their hatred to Episcopacy, and the Government stood aloof, while they exercised unheard of cruelties and insults towards the ministers of the disestablished Church. As their principles would not allow them to submit to Episcopacy in its connection with the State, so neither could they ever amalgamate with Established Presbyterianism, but have preserved a distinct existence, under the title of the "Reformed Presbyterian Synod." At present they are a very insignificant sect in Scotland, and are only distinguished by their rigid adherence to the Solemn League and Covenant, and their extreme dislike to State interference in matters of religion, and to every thing savoring of Episcopacy. It is curious that the Revolution Government caused to be embodied, and enrolled on the list of the regular British army, a number of these religious zealots, who, under military discipline, soon became as distinguished for loyalty and order as their predecessors had been for rebellion and anarchy. The 26th Regiment, or "Cameronians," are said to have been formed from the motley group of "Hillmen" who used to persecute the Episcopal clergy, and came from the West to Edinburgh for the purpose of overawing the Convention of Estates in 1689.—E.]

his prudence to avoid such escapes when pressed with a pungent argument. The matter is this :—

The author of the "Case of the Afflicted Clergy" had said, that the Presbyterian ministers never preached against the disorders of the rabble. Now, hear G[ilbert] R[ule]—"Second Vindication," p. 97—"This is false, though we thought not fit to make that our constant theme." Now, that rabbling work was such a *barbarous* and *unchristian work*, that one would think it had not misbecome the Presbyterian ministers themselves to have made it at least *very much* their "theme" on that occasion. But the *secret* is not here. He adds—"And if but few did it, it was because they who were the actors in that *scene* little regarded the preaching of the sober Presbyterians." A great many things may be observed here. For besides that he owns they were but *few* who *preached* against the *rabbling*, it might be of use to inquire at our author what kind of *scene* he took it to be? Whether was it *tragical*, or *comical*, or both—tragical to the Prelatists, and comical to the Presbyterians? It were worth inquiring, likewise, whom he meant by *sober Presbyterian preachers?* If there are any such in the nation, how many? Where do they preach, &c.? But I insist not on these things, because the *secret* is not amongst them.

Yet the next thing he produces is worth the noticing. "*And they*"—the sober Presbyterian preachers, if they had preached against the rabbling—"*should have lost their* SWEET WORDS." Now, here is subject afforded for several weighty controversies. For it may be made a question, whether it be the duty of *sober Presbyterian preachers* to preach *righteousness* to a "rebellious people, whether they will hear, or whether they will forbear?" It may be made another—Whether our author here gave up all the rabblers to a *reprobate sense?* It is possible he meant so. For the *sweetest words* the *soberest* Presbyterians can utter in their *preachings* are not too precious to be spent on such as are in a state of *reclaimableness*. But that which I take to be the most proper question—the question that ariseth most naturally from the text—is, whether Presbyterian *words* are not *sweeter* than that they should be *spent* on such *needless* purposes as the recommendation and assertion of *righteousness*, and the condemnation of *iniquity?* Whether it had

not been an unaccountable *prodigality* in them to have *lost their sweet words* about such *trifling* concerns as these? But neither is the *secret* here; but it follows now.

"These practices of the rabble were publicly spoken against by ministers both before they were acted for preventing them, and after, for reproving them, and preventing the like." Here it is, I say. Has he not here discovered an important *secret* of his party? Has he not discovered that the rabbling of the clergy[1] was not the product of chance or accident, but a deliberated, a consulted, an advised politic? Has he not discovered that even the *sober* Presbyterian ministers were privy to the plot of it? Has he not told that "they spake against it, before it was acted, for preventing it?" And doth it not follow clearly that they *knew* of it *before* it was acted; for if they had *known* nothing of it, how could they have *spoken* against it for *preventing* it?

But though they knew of it, that it was to be done, yet it seems they *consented* not that it should be *done*, for "they spake against it for preventing of it!" But I am afraid our author here turned *weary* of his *sincerity*. For who spake publicly against these practices of the rabble? Or *where*, or *when*, were they spoken against "before they were acted?" I dare challenge him to name one of his most sober Presbyterian ministers who preached *publicly against them for preventing of them*. When I am put to it, I can name more than one or two who pretend to be of the *first rank* of the "sober Presbyterian" ministers, who knew of them indeed, and consulted *privately* about them, and said—"*It was the surest way to have the curates once dispossessed;*" because—"*once dispossessed, they might find difficulties in being repossessed.*" But I never heard of so much as *one* who preached against them before they were *done*. I am very confident G[ilbert] R[ule] cannot name *one*. Indeed, seeing, as our author grants, they knew of the rabbling *before it was acted*, if they had been so serious against it as they should have been, and as our author would have us believe they were, how natural and easy, as well as Christian and dutiful, had it been to have given advertisements to the poor men who were to

[1] [The account of the rabbling of the clergy, and the insults and sufferings which they endured, forms the subjects of some other Works of our author.—E.

suffer it, about it ? Was ever any such thing done ? But it seems Presbyterian *words* were *sweeter* to Presbyterian palates than common humanity or Christian charity. They were too *sweet* to be *lost* in such *advertisements*. By this time, the reader, I think, has got a proof of G[ilbert] R[ule]'s tenderness even to his own *herd*, when the argument of an adversary pinched him. But this is not the highest step.

For, 10. If an argument straitens him, he never stands to baffle, and expose, and contradict, and make a liar of his *own* learned, sensible, civil, modest *self*. And here, again, one might write a large volume, but I shall confine myself to a competent number of instances.

First, then, you never saw a Prelatist and a Presbyterian contradicting one another in more plain, opposite, and peremptory terms, than he has done himself on several occasions. Take this taste—In his "Answer" to Dr Stillingfleet's "Irenicum" (p. 64), he is at great pains to prove that where *Episcopacy* is, *Presbyters* have no *power*. Particularly he has these two profound arguments for it—"1. If Bishops be set over Presbyters, they must either be only *Præsides*, which is not contrary to Parity, or they must have authority above and over their brethren; and if so, they may rule without their brethren, seeing they may command them," &c.—"2. If Presbyters under a Bishop have ruling power, either they may determine without or against his consent, or not. If so, the *Bishop* is but a *President;* if not, the *Presbyters* are but *cyphers*." Now, who would think that one of G[ilbert] R[ule]'s courage would ever have parted with such an important proposition, especially having such impregnable arguments for it ? Yet, consider if he has not done it most notoriously in his Answer to the Doctor's "Unreasonableness of the Separation," &c. p. 182, where he has these words—"He (the Doctor) undertaketh to prove that the English Episcopacy doth not take away the whole power of Presbyters. We do not allege that it taketh away the whole power of Presbyters, for that were to reduce them into the same order with the rest of the people; but we say it usurpeth an undue power over them," &c.

Again, in his "First Vindication" of *his* Church of Scotland, his *cause* led him, in answer to Question 10, to say

that " K[ing] J[ames]'s Toleration was against Law." He was pressed with this argument about the *inclinations of the people*, that not fifty gentlemen in all Scotland (out of the West) did, upon the Indulgence, forsake the churches to frequent meeting-houses, and his answer was—" They clave to the former way"—i. e. continued in the Episcopal Communion—" because the Law stood for it." Is it not plain here that the meeting-houses were *contrary to Law?* Hear him now, in his " Second Vindication" (p. 43, 44, passim), when he was pressed with the scandal of his party's complying with the dispensing power, and erecting meeting-houses *contrary to Law*. He affirmed boldly that the " dispensing power was according to Law," and " K[ing] J[ames] was enabled by Law to grant his Toleration."

Again, in his " Second Vindication," in answer to Letter I. § 9, p. 12, when he had the Meeting of Estates to apologize for, for suffering and allowing persons to sit as members who " were not qualified according to Law," he granted some such members sat there, but " they had been most unjustly forfeited in the late Reign." Even *Parliamentary* forfeitures, you see, were most *unjust* forfeitures, and there was no reason that they should *exclude* these gentlemen from their *just* and *ancient* rights and privileges. But when he was pressed by the author of the "Case of the Afflicted Clergy," &c. with this, that " many ministers' benefices were unjustly and illegally kept from them," he got his *cloak on the other shoulder*, as we say —" If the authority of the nation in the Convention or Parliament have determined otherwise, I know not where their legal right can be founded" (p. 96, § 6). It was not so much as *knowable* to our author in that case, that there might be *most unjust Parliamentary* determinations.

It were an endless work to adduce all such little *squabbles* as these between himself and himself. I shall insist, therefore, only on *two* more, which are a little more considerable.

And, first, our author was not at more pains about any one thing, in his Answer to Dr Stillingfleet's " Irenicum," than the *inseparableness* that is between the *teaching* and *ruling power* of *Presbyters*. He spent no less than eight or nine pages about it, stretching his invention to find arguments for it. Whoso pleases to turn to page 79, may see the whole deduction. He is as earnest about it in his

"True Representation," &c. These are his words (Prop. 13) —"There being no disparity of power amongst ministers by Christ's grant of power to them, no man can make this disparity by setting one over the rest; neither can they devolve their power on one of themselves. For Christ hath given no such warrant to men to dispose of his ordinances as they see fit; and power being delegated to them by Him, they cannot so commit it to another to exercise it for them, as to deprive themselves of it. Also, it being not a *licence* only, but a *trust*, of which they must give an account, they must perform the work by themselves, as they will be answerable." Now, it is not possible for one to contradict himself more than he hath done both *indirectly* and *directly* in this matter.

He hath contradicted himself *indirectly*, and by unavoidable consequence, in so far as he hath owned or owns himself a Presbyterian, and for the *lawfulness*, not to say the *necessity*, of *Scottish* Presbyterian General Assemblies of the *present* constitution. For, are all the *ruling officers* of Christ's appointment, both *preaching* and *governing elders*, allowed to be *members* of General Assemblies? Do they all discharge their "trust," and "perform their work by themselves there, as they will be answerable to Him from whom they got their trust?" Doth not every Presbytery, consisting of twelve, sixteen, or twenty *preaching* and as many *ruling elders*, send only some *three* or *four preaching elders*, and only one *ruling elder*, to the General Assembly? Do they not *delegate* these, and *devolve* their *power* upon them, and constitute them their *representatives* for the Assembly?[1] Let their *commissions* be

[1] [Whatever may have been the practice or theory in Bishop Sage's time, which was at the triumph of Presbyterianism in Scotland, the Established General Assemblies have ceased to be representative or delegated. They are composed of "ministers" who are members by *rotation*, as their names appear on the roll of the Presbyteries with which they are connected, but the "ruling elders" are always elected. By Act 5th of the General Assembly 1694, it is provided that all Presbyteries of twelve parishes, or under that number, shall send two "ministers" and one "ruling elder" to General Assembly;—that all Presbyteries consisting of eighteen parishes, or under that number, but above twelve, shall send three "ministers" and one "ruling elder;"—and that all Presbyteries consisting of twenty-four parishes shall send five "ministers" and two "ruling elders." By an Act in 1712 each Presbytery whose number exceeded thirty ministerial charges was to send six "ministers" and three "ruling elders" to the General Assembly. This has been the rule since 1713.—E.]

inspected, and let it be tried, if it is not so. Now, how is such a *delegation* consistent with our author's position about the *indevolcibility* or *indelegability* of such a *power?* It were easy to pursue this further in its consequents. Now, what an ill thing is it for a man thus to sap and subvert all his own foundations—to contradict the fundamental *maxims* of his own *scheme* by such unadvised propositions? But this is not the worst of it. He hath *contradicted* himself most *directly* in that same individual "True Representation," &c. in answer to the 10th Objection; and in his "Second Vindication," p. 154, 155. For in both places he endeavours to justify the taking of all *ruling power* out of the hands of the *Episcopal ministers*, and the *putting* it only in the hands of the *known sound Presbyterians*, reserving to the Episcopal ministers their *teaching power* only. It is true, it is evident he found himself sadly puzzled in the matter, and was forced to bring in his good friend *Necessity*, and the old *Covenant distinction* of *status Ecclesiæ turbatus* and *paratus* to lend him a lift. I have considered his friend *Necessity* sufficiently in my book, and thither I refer the reader for satisfaction about it. But what to do with his *præsens Ecclesiæ status*, I do not so well know; only this I dare say, granting it to be so nimble as to break *scot-free* through Divine institutions, yet it can neither by *itself*, nor with *Necessity* to help it, reconcile notorious *contradictions*.

The other instance I shall adduce is in a very important matter—no less than the *Presbyterian separation* from the Episcopal Church of Scotland. He was put to it to defend it in both "Vindications" of *his* Church of Scotland.—"First Vindication," in answer to Question 4; "Second Vindication," in answer to Letter II. § 3. All the reasons he has adduced for that separation may be reduced to these three—1. *Episcopacy*. 2. The Episcopal ministers were *usurpers* or *intruders*. For, 3. They had not the *call* of the *people*, and so the people were not bound to own them as their ministers. These are his grounds, I say, on which he justifies their separation from us. Now, hear him in his "Rational Defence," &c. published, as I have told, since the beginning of the late Revolution; by consequence, after the *Scottish schism* was in its full maturity. Hear him there, I say, and you never heard man reject any thing more fairly,

more fully, or more directly, than he hath done these his own grounds. Let us try them one by one.

1. For *Episcopacy*, turn first to page 95, and you shall find these very words—" Whatever fault we find with the ministers of the Church and the Hierarchy, we do not separate because of these. We would join with you"—*(the English Church)*—" for all these grievances, if you would but suffer us to do it without sinning against God in that which is our personal action." Turn next to page 150. There he offers at enumerating the causes that cannot justify a separation, and he talks particularly about Episcopacy thus—" We are grieved with Prelatical Government, and taking away that parity of power that Christ hath given to the ordinary ministers of his Church. This we cannot approve, and therefore ministers ought rather to suffer deprivation of the public exercise of their ministry than own it. And people also ought not to own that their lordly authority that they exercise; yet, because this is not required to be acknowledged as a lawful power in the Church by the people, I see not that we should withdraw from the public Assemblies merely because there are Diocesan Bishops set over the Church, except our owning them by submitting to their jurisdiction is required as one of the terms of communion with the Church." Whoso pleases may find more to the same purpose, pages 157, 275, &c. Nay, so condescending is he in that book (p. 159), that he can allow Bishops their temporal honours and dignities. " We meddle not with their titles and revenues," says he; " these are the magistrates' gifts, and do not cross Christ's institution, whatever inconvenience may be in them."

2. As to the *plea* of the *usurpation or intrusion* of the Prelatists, Dr Stillingfleet had alleged that the Dissenters pleaded that " most of the present ministers of the Church of England were *usurpers*, and that from such the people might lawfully separate."—" We deny both parts of the assertion," says G[ilbert] R[ule], p. 115, 116. " Whatever *usurpation* some of them may be guilty of, we know most of them have the (*tacite* at least) consent of the people *a post facto*; and, therefore, however they may be guilty of *intrusion* in their entry, in their continuing in their places they are no *usurpers*. Neither do we own it to be

lawful to separate from every minister that is an *usurper*, merely on the account of his usurpation." And he discourses the point copiously, as the curious reader may find (Ibid.)

3. Neither is he less positive about the third thing which, in his *Scottish* management of the *plea*, he insists on as the great reason of the former, viz. *the popular call*. For Dr Stillingfleet had adduced Dr Owen as asserting, that the depriving of the people of the right to choose their own pastors was a just ground of separation. And G[ilbert] R[ule] answers—" If Dr Owen hath done so, let it pass for a part of the Independent judgment, which was a mistake of that eminent servant of God: others are not of that mind." And a little after—" The people, by the laws of the Gospel, have the right of election of their own pastors; but it doth not follow that they ought not to bear with being hindered the exercise of this right for the sake of peace and unity." And, p. 151—" Depriving the people of their right of choosing their own church officers is also matter of complaint; but we must bear it rather than separate for that from a Church." And, page 197, when he came to assert that *right* of the *people*, he told he did " not make the depriving of the people of that power a cause of separation." Nay, not once, but very frequently, he lays the whole stress of the *English* separation upon the sinful terms of communion, as he calls them, imposed by the Church of England. Let the Church purge her offices of human inventions. Let her lay aside the Liturgy, the Cross in Baptism, kneeling at the receiving of the Eucharist, and Holydays, &c., and he and all his party shall join with her cheerfully. Vide p. 24, 81, 106, 107, 109, 120, 133, 144, 151, &c. Now, let any man, even of his own sect, reconcile these things. Let him shew why *Episcopacy*, *usurpation*, and *depriving the people* of their *right* to *choose* their own *pastors*, should be so *every way* sufficient grounds for *separating* from the Church of *Scotland*, and so *noways* sufficient grounds for *separating* from the Church of England. What could move the man to venture upon such lumpish, bulkish contradictions? For my part, I cannot guess at another motive than that which I have frequently mentioned, viz. the present Argument. In *England* he had some other things

to bear the burden, but no other thing in Scotland, and it was necessary for his *Vindicatorship* to *justify* the *separation*. And, therefore, what could not do it in *England* behoved to do it in *Scotland*.

But perhaps he may endeavour to extricate himself by running for shelter to the old Scottish plea of the *Covenant*. For is not Prelacy *abjured* in Scotland? Is not the *oath* of God upon *Presbyterians*, nay, on all the *nation*, not to own *Prelacy?* Are not all the Prelatists *perjured*, &c.? And now may not the Presbyterians *separate* lawfully?

He seems, indeed, to betake himself to this *plea* in his "Answer" to the "Historical Relation of the General Assembly," § 20, p. 189. "The setting up of Episcopacy," says he, "was more sinful in this nation *(Scotland)* than it could be elsewhere, because of the oath of God that the nation is under against it, not in later times only, but in the times of King James the Sixth, who caused the whole nation swear the Shorter Confession of Faith, called the National Covenant, where it is abjured." Now, not to insist on shewing that, upon the supposition all this were true, it militates only against *Episcopacy*, it could conclude it only, but neither the *usurpation*, nor the *depriving* the *people* of their *right*, &c. to be a sufficient ground for the *separation*. Nor yet to insist on the notorious falsehood of the supposition, viz. that Episcopacy was abjured in King James the Sixth's time:—not to insist on these things, I say, if he *himself* is strong enough for *himself*, *himself* will not suffer *himself* to make the abjuration of Episcopacy in Scotland a sufficient ground for *separating* from the Episcopal Church of Scotland. For in the fortieth page of his "Rational Defence," &c. attempting to shew a difference between complying with the Church of England at the Reformation and complying with her *now*, he opens thus:—"I might here allege the obligation of the National Covenant that we are under, as they were not to whom the Doctor[1] would make our case parallel"—i.e. those who lived at the Reformation—"though I never thought that that Bond made any sins or duties that were not such antecedently." Now, (not to insist on the *pleasantness* of pretending that he might insist on a *topic*

[1] [Stillingfleet.—E.]

in which he instantly acknowledges there is no force)—if *oaths* and *covenants make no duties nor sins which were not such antecedently*, I would fain understand how the National Covenant, or whatever Covenant has been in Scotland, could make Episcopacy a *sufficient ground* for *separating* from the Church of Scotland, if it was not a *sufficient ground* for *such separation antecedently* to these Covenants. Thus, he himself hath cut off himself from all hopes of escaping by the Covenant. Indeed, there is no possibility of escape left him. It is not in the power of nature to rescue one who is so plunged over head and ears in such a sink of contradictions.

What hath been said might be sufficient in all conscience for representing his own *unnatural* unmercifulness towards himself; for what can be more *unmercifully* done to any one than to demonstrate him to all the world to be a *manifest liar?* And who can be a *more* manifest *liar* than he who upon every turn vomits contradictions? Yet this is not all; perhaps it is not the worst.

There is such an *intimate relation* between *himself*, and his books written by *himself*, that I think it is reasonable to say, that whosoever treats his books with any degree of *impudence*, is every whit as *impudent* towards *himself*. Now, it is not possible that ranker, more merciless, or more impudent injury can be done to any than himself hath done to his "Second Vindication" of *his* Church of Scotland, at least, to near three parts of four of it:—to it, so far as it answers the "Four Letters," the "Case of the Afflicted Clergy," and the "Late Letter." For he hath engraven on it such indelible characters of disingenuity, partiality, injustice, unfair dealing, effrontery, ridiculousness, &c. as perhaps never book was injured or bespattered with since writing of books was in fashion. The reader may think this is a very strange charge, but I can make it good to a demonstration by a very plain and obvious deduction.

Thus: Some of the Episcopal clergy thought themselves obliged for their own vindication to give some short representations of their circumstances, and the unkindly treatment they had met with from the Presbyterian party, anno 1688, 1689, &c. The whole nation knows they were so far from feigning instances, or aggravating the circumstances

of their sufferings, that they told not the twentieth part of what they suffered, nor represented what they told in all its proper blacknesses. However, so much was told, as was enough to represent the Presbyterian temper in no very lovely colours. The party were sensible of this, and, therefore, it was necessary to try if there was a possibility of collecting and connecting some rags to cover their shame and nakedness. The expedient they agreed to was, that the *accounts* given by the Episcopal clergy should be answered and refuted, but then the difficulty was to find an author who had *talents* proper for such a *task*. It was committed, first to Mr Alexander Pitcairn, but after he had thought some time about it, it seems it stood with his stomach. He had not so far abandoned all principles of truth, and honesty, and ingenuity, as was necessary for such an undertaking. *He* resigned the employment, therefore, into the hands of another *general meeting* of the party, and told them he would have nothing to do with it.

This, no doubt, was a discouragement to all others of any *wit* or *probity* to undertake it, for if it was to be *done* to any good purpose at all, Pitcairn was as fit for *doing* of it as any of the *sect;* and if he gave it over, after so much deliberation about it, it was to be presumed there was *frost* in it; it was not safe to meddle with it. Thus it fell to the share of G[ilbert] R[ule], as he tells himself both in his Preface and in the beginning of his book.

Such an *odd* undertaking did indeed require a suitable undertaker, and now it had one as *oddly* qualified for it as the world has heard of. For if we may believe himself in his "Preface" to his "Animadversions" on Doctor Stillingfleet's "Irenicum"—for who but himself would have been at pains to write Prefaces to his books?—"He died a worthy and much lamented author, anno 1662." And, so far as I can learn, he continued thus in the state of the dead till towards the end of the year 1688, i. e. about twenty-six years. Then, indeed, he returned to life. Now it is not to be imagined [that] his soul, all this while was either in the regions of eternal rewards or eternal punishments[1]; for then, how

[1] [It is impossible to justify the witticisms here derived from allusions to sacred subjects, and we only regret that our venerable author should

should it have returned? Doubtless, therefore, it was in some *Purgatory*, but what *Purgatory* is not easy to determine. I am confident it was not the ordinary *Purgatory* in which people are purged from the dregs of corruption they carry out of this world with them, for he came alive again more *corrupted* and *vicious* than ever. Possibly he has been in some *new Purgatory* which the Pope built lately for keeping a seminary of such as he lets out upon occasion, for *plagues* to the *Protestant* Churches. Whatever *Purgatory* it was, our Author came out of it *purged* pretty clean of all principles of *sense*, or *shame*, or *honesty*. And now who fitter than he to be the *Vindicator* of the *Kirk of Scotland?* Before his death he wrote only such *books as were little in their own eyes* (Preface to "Animadversions" on "Irenicum"), but he ventured on writing such books as his "Second Vindication" after his *resurrection*.

I have given this account of our Author and the occasion of his writing the book, for fixing the reader's attention, that he may consider it with the greater application.

Now, in this book—his "Second Vindication," I mean—he rejected by the bulk all the matters of fact which were contained in the "Four Letters," because they were not *attested*, as if, forsooth, the writers of the Letters had had opportunity to have had all the particular cases tried in formal courts before indifferent judges, and with all the usual solemnities of process—as if it had been their intention, by their Letters, to have made formal pursuits for the injuries had been done the clergy—as if the world could not have easily discerned that all their purpose in writing these Letters was not to sue legally for redress, but to represent to their friends matter of fact in the common way of history. Well! to mend this, however, the "Case of the Afflicted Clergy" gave him *attestations* enough in all conscience. But did that satisfy him? No more than if he had got none at all, for they were not worth a button; they were not probative, they were but partial. He had reason to reject every one of them.

have for an instant forgotten that reverence which ought always to be preserved when discoursing upon the doctrines of religion. But in justice to him we must add, that he only followed the practice common to all sides in the party writings of the times.—E.]

Thus, when the Author of the "Case," &c., cited Doctor Burnet, G[ilbert] R[ule] replied in these words—"He farther proveth our persecution by citing some passages out of *Doctor Burnet*, whom, being a party, we are not to admit as a witness against us" (p. 85). What! No! not Doctor Burnet? No! not the *son* of such a *mother*? No! not the *nephew* of such an *uncle*? No! not the *brother* of such a *brother*? No! not the *cousin-german* of such a *cousin-german*?[1] No! not the *man* who has all alongst advised the *Scottish* Prelatists, particularly Mr Malcolm, one of the ministers of Edinburgh, to return to their native country,[2] and submit to the ecclesiastical government *now* established?[3] Do you reject even him as a party?[4]

[1] [To understand this severe though amply merited attack on Dr Gilbert Burnet, Bishop of Salisbury, who lived several years after Bishop Sage published this work, a short statement is necessary. Bishop Burnet's *mother* was a sister of Sir Archibald Johnston of Warriston, a noted Covenanting Presbyterian, who was the implacable enemy of the Church in Scotland, and hence the sarcastic queries—"the *son* of such a *mother*"—"the *nephew* of such an *uncle*." Burnet's mother was, like her brother, a zealous supporter of the Covenanters, though his father steadily adhered to the Church, and was exiled several years for his loyalty. The allusion to Burnet's *brother* is not so clear. His *cousin-german* may indicate either Sir Alexander Burnet, or one of Johnston of Warriston's children, who were, according to Burnet himself, thirteen in number. Johnston was executed for high treason after the Restoration, and occupies a prominent place in the Presbyterian Martyrology.—E.]

[2] [The violence of the Presbyterians in Scotland after the Revolution compelled many of the parochial Episcopal clergy to save their lives by retiring into England and Ireland.—E.]

[3] [It is certain that Bishop Burnet rendered this advice. Such was the effect of private resentment, latitudinarian principles, and political partizanship upon a man possessed of more than ordinary abilities and, in other matters, of much acute discernment.—E.]

[4] [To deny that we are greatly indebted to Bishop Burnet for his industry in recording the events of his own stirring times, and for rescuing from oblivion the memory of persons and things of very great interest, would be ungenerous. But it is impossible to shield this eminent Prelate from the charges of prejudice, want of consistent principle, and, what is worse, of *ingratitude* to his native Church, in which he had been educated, and ordained Deacon and Presbyter. In after years, when he was high in Court favour, and might have cast his powerful influence as a defence around her and her suffering ministers, he "stood afar off;" nay, when applied to for that purpose by a Prelate of his Mother Church, he cruelly replied—"That he did not now meddle in Scottish affairs." The Church in Scotland has often in past years had to complain of such neglect and coldness from the dignitaries of her richer and more powerful Sister, and her enemies in this country have made it an occasion of derision and doubt,

But to proceed—If the person who was barbarously used by the rabble gave an account of his own usage (and who could do it better?) and subscribed his name to it, this was such an *attestation* as G[ilbert] R[ule] thought fit to reject, with a *Fie upon it*. It was *teste me ipso* (p. 88), and so not worth an halfpenny. As if it had been possible for a minister, when the rabble surprized him, and came upon him unawares, still to have had witnesses at hand for *attesting* all their rudenesses! As if it had not been enough, for all the design of such *accounts*, that a man of known probity and reputation subscribed his own narration of a matter of fact which so nearly concerned himself, and thereby declared his readiness to make the matter appear, as far as he was capable! If the rabbled minister adduced witnesses, as was done in the "Case,"[1] &c. in several instances, and they subscribed the account, was he then satisfied? Never an ace more than before. "All of his witnesses are the sworn enemies of Presbyterians, and in a combination to defame them" (p. 88). And again (p. 100)—"His first collection is of accounts that he hath had from his complices, a company of men avowed and malicious enemies of all Presbyterians, and all this attested by themselves." Nay, though they were not Episcopal *ministers*, but *laics*, who *attested*, if it was done in favour of Episcopal ministers, that was enough to prove them friends to Episcopacy, and so they were no more *boni et legales homines*, as he calls his *unexceptionable witnesses* (p. 111).

Thus, the account which was sent to London[2] immediately after the second tumult at Glasgow, which happened on the 17th of February, anno 1688-9, was subscribed by James

as if she was despised by, or different from, the English Church; but to have been neglected and treated with coldness by one of *her own sons*, when she was in such afflicted circumstances, was indeed severely mortifying; and his having been guilty of such neglect and coldness, tarnishes, in the eyes of Churchmen, any lustre which may surround the name of Gilbert Burnet.—E.]

[1] [See "Case of the Afflicted Clergy in Scotland," London, 4to. 1690. —E.]

[2] [It is worthy of notice, that all the works of the disestablished Episcopal clergy at that period were printed and published in London. No Edinburgh printer had courage to raise a host of Presbyterian enemies against himself till the time of the learned Ruddimans, who were ardent members of the Church in its most trying times.—E.]

Gibson, then one of the Magistrates of the city; John Gilhagie, who had been a Magistrate the year before; and Patrick Bell, son to Sir John Bell, a discreet young gentleman, and merchant in the city. These three subscribed it, that it might *make faith*. It was directed to Dr Fall, Principal of the College of Glasgow, that he might shew it to the then P[rince] of O[range], and crave that, now that he had taken upon him the government of the Kingdom of Scotland, he would interpose his authority for discharging such tumults for the future, &c. Doctor Fall actually addressed [it] to his Highness, and shewed [him] the Account. All this was done before the Scottish Estates met in March.

Now, consider [Gilbert] R[ule]'s discussion of this Account (p. 94.)—"John"—he should have called him *James*—"Gibson was a party, and made a Bailie by the Archbishop;[1] and all know the Prelates' inclinations towards the present civil Government."[2] Have ye not here a goodly specimen of both our author's *law* and his *logic?* "John Gilhagie is looked on by all as a foolish and rash man, who little considereth what he doth." Now, what was his testimony worth after our author had given him such a character? "Patrick Bell and his brother were soon after seized for treasonable practices, were long in prison, and are now under bail."[3] And is not G[ilbert] R[ule] now a potent author? How easily and readily he can reject testimonies! And these three once thus rejected, there never was such a thing as that Presbyterian tumult at Glasgow, no, not though there are hundreds in Glasgow who can *attest* that every syllable of the Account was true. Again, p. 109, in

[1] [John Paterson, successively Bishop of Galloway and Edinburgh, Archbishop of Glasgow at the Revolution, son of John Paterson, Bishop of Ross. If Mr Gibson was actually "made" a Bailie or Magistrate of Glasgow by the Archbishop's influence, Mr Gilbert Rule ought to have recollected that this was strictly legal, his Grace being Lord of the Regality.—E.]

[2] [Archbishop Paterson was at that time residing in Edinburgh, where he died in December 1708, in the seventy-sixth year of his age. Like his other ejected brethren of the Bishops and clergy, the Archbishop had very sufficient reasons for not admiring Mr Gilbert Rule's "present civil Government."—E.]

[3] [But Mr Gilbert Rule ought to have stated that those two gentlemen had been in prison, and were "under bail," merely for disaffection to William's Government.—E.]

Mr Gellie's case,[1] how easily could he reject all the testimonies that were adduced? Why? "*They that testify for him are of his own party!*" And then let them testify that they saw a *nose* on G[ilbert] R[ule]'s own *face*, and for any thing I know he should cut off his own *nose* to have them *liars*.[2]

And now let the world judge of this way of disproving historical relations and attestations of matter of fact. Is it not plain that, according to this standard, it is impossible to *attest* any thing? For, as I take it, the whole nation is so divided between Prelatists and Presbyterians, or those who favour one of the sides, that you shall not find many neutrals. Now, who is obliged to take the testimonies of Presbyterians in matters of fact more than the testimonies of Prelatists? Have they any divine, natural, or municipal law for the validity of their testimonies beyond other men? If they have not, as I shall still be apt to believe, till G[ilbert] R[ule] produces the law, then I would fain know how G[ilbert] R[ule] by his own standard can allow, that Presbyterian witnesses should appear before any Court Ecclesiastical or Civil against Episcopal ministers. Nay, may not the Presbyterians themselves reject even G[ilbert] R[ule]'s testimony? Nay, I say they ought to do it. Why? He stands nearly related to Episcopacy. How? Let it be inquired into, and I will hold him two to one, if he was baptized at all, he was baptized either by a Bishop, or by a Presbyter that submitted to Bishops. But if so, then good morrow to his testimony. For thus the argument runs—G[ilbert] R[ule] was baptized by a Prelate or a Prelatist, "*and all know the Prelates' inclinations*," &c. Why this reasoning should not hold in G[ilbert] R[ule]'s case, as well

[1] [The Rev. Paul Gellie, incumbent of the parish of Airth, in the county of Stirling and Diocese of Edinburgh. Mr Gellie was accused of exhorting his parishioners to pray for King James in private, and of saying that "he expected a blessed reformation, but that they had only gotten wretched tyrants and ungodly rulers to govern them, and the people had no security for life or property." It is needless to add that he was deprived of his parish. See Lawson's "History of the Scottish Episcopal Church from the Revolution to the Present Time," p. 128, and note at page 95 of this Preface.—E.]

[2] [Our author is here rather personal in his sarcasm. Mr Gilbert Rule is described by some of his controversial opponents as noted for a peculiarly formed and very *red nose*.—E.]

as in James Gibson's case, I desire to learn of G[ilbert] R[ule] when he is at leisure. But this is not all.

As he rejected all the *attestations* in that book without any shew of reason, so he did some in despite of the common sense of mankind. For, setting this in its due light, it is to be remembered, that in that book there are accounts of the insolencies committed by the rabble upon such and such ministers in the Presbyteries of Glasgow, Hamilton, Irvine, Ayr, Paisley, Dunbarton, &c. Now, these accounts were occasioned thus—When the rabble was in its fury, and making havock of all the clergy in the western Diocese of Glasgow, some of them met at Glasgow upon the 22d of January 1688-9, to consider what might be proper for them to do for their own preservation, and protection against the rage of their persecutors; and the best expedient they could then fall upon was to send Doctor Scott,[1] Dean of Glasgow, to London, to represent their condition to his Highness the P[rince] of O[range], who had then assumed the government of the nation, and crave protection according to law. And that the Doctor might be the better instructed, it was resolved that particular *accounts* of the *violences* [which] had been done to the clergy within the above named

[1] [The result of this mission was rather favourable, for in less than a month a Proclamation was issued, "expressly prohibiting and discharging all disturbance on account of religion," and "that no interruption be made, or if any hath been made, that it cease, in the free and peaceable exercise of religion, whether in churches, or in public or private meetings of those of a different persuasion;" and requiring all men in arms "immediately to separate, disband themselves, and retire to their respective dwellings." This Proclamation, however, instead of improving matters, only rendered them worse, for the well disposed people, who had taken arms for the defence of their ministers, laid them down in obedience to the royal mandate; but the mob retained theirs, and finding the clergy defenceless, persecuted them with renewed ardour. In the city of Glasgow, on the very Sunday after the Proclamation had been made, there was a furious outbreak of these misguided fanatics, who assaulted the Magistrates and congregation in the High Church or Cathedral, while they were worshipping their Maker, and wounded many. This was the outrage referred to, page 83, which was carefully reported to Principal Fall, who happened to be in London at the time, in order that he might represent matters truly to the Prince of Orange, and endeavour to get redress, or at least the protection of Government, for his afflicted brethren. In this, however, he did not succeed. Presbytery was in the ascendant, and the new monarch could not afford to shield its foes, without exciting its suspicion, and perhaps incurring its anger.—E.]

Presbyteries should be digested by such ministers as lived within these Presbyteries respectively. This was done. The Account of the *violences* done to those who lived within the Presbytery of Ayr was digested and signed by Mr Alexander Gregory,[1] Mr William Irvine,[2] and Mr Francis Fordyce;[3] that for Paisley by Mr Fullerton[4] and Mr Taylor, ministers at Paisley; that for Glasgow by Mr George[5] and Mr Sage, &c. And that the truth of these accounts might be the more unquestionable, the subscribers (in some of of them at least) undertook to make all the particulars appear to be true, upon the greatest peril, if they should get a fair hearing. What greater evidence of truth and ingenuity could have been expected or required of people in such circumstances? Yet even these accounts G[ilbert] R[ule] rejected as readily and confidently as he did any other. He rejected them, I say, *indiscriminately*, and without taking notice of any difference between them, and such as were not written upon any such occasion—such as were only vouched *teste me ipso*. Was this like either the *sense* or the *discretion* that were proper for the *Vindicator* of a Church? I do not incline so much as in the least to insinuate that any of the accounts contained in the "Case of the Afflicted Clergy" were false. I am satisfied they were all very true. All I intend is to represent G[ilbert] R[ule]'s impudent rashness in rejecting all *accounts* with the same *facility*. And certainly, whosoever considers this seriously, cannot but reckon of his book as written with as little *wit* or *discretion* as *truth* or *ingenuity*. And all this will appear more evident still, if it be considered that all this did not content him, but he was such a fool as to stumble upon the same methods [which] himself condemned most in his adversaries, when he had any matter of *fact* to *attest*.

He was very careful, as he tells frequently, to have his

[1] [Parson of Ayr.—E.]

[2] [Minister of Kirkmichael in Ayrshire, and afterwards Bishop of Dunblane.—E.]

[3] [Parson of Cumnock.—E.]

[4] [Afterwards Bishop of Edinburgh. He was consecrated at the same time with Sage in 1705, succeeded Bishop Rose in the Diocese of Edinburgh, and died in April 1727.—E.]

[5] [He was minister of the Barony parish in the city of Glasgow.—E.]

particular informations from all corners concerning all the instances of rabbling which were represented in the *Prelatic* pamphlets. But from whom had he these informations mostly? From the very *rabblers* themselves. It were both tedious and unprofitable to trace him through all instances. One may be sufficient for an example. and I shall choose the very first that is to be found in his book, viz. that of Mr Gabriel Russell, minister of Govan.[1]

The author of the "Second Letter" had given a brief and just account of the treatment that poor gentleman had met with,[2] and G[ilbert] R[ule] convels it thus—"To this I oppose," says he, "the truth of the story, as it is attested by the subscriptions of nine persons who were present"—i. e. nine of the rabblers, for so Mr Russell himself assured me, repeating over these very names which G[ilbert] R[ule] has in his book. And is not this a pleasant *attestation?* Is it not *pleasant*, I say, to rely upon the testimony of such barbarous villains, and take their own *word* for their own *vindication?* Yet there is one thing a great deal more *pleasant* yet in the story.

The author of the "Second Letter" had affirmed that Mr Russell was beaten by the rabble—"but they"—(the nine whom he adduces)—"utterly deny that any of them did beat him." And it is true, indeed, none of these nine did beat him, but it is as true that he was beaten, and one James Colquhoun was the person who did it; and therefore his name was concealed, and not set down with the other nine. And now I refer it to the reader, if it is not probable that he has got a parcel of sweet history from G[ilbert] R[ule] in his "Second Vindication."

But I go on. As he thus adduced the rabble witnessing for themselves, so when he was put to it he never stood on

[1] [A parish on both sides of the Clyde, immediately south and west of Glasgow, a great part of which is now a suburb, and the whole of it may be considered one of the beautiful environs, of that city.—E.]

[2] [About six o'clock in the evening of Christmas Day 1688, Mr Russell was assaulted by a number of Presbyterians in his own house, his wife and daughter were cruelly beaten, the money belonging to the poor was carried away, and he was threatened with a more severe treatment if he ever again officiated in the parish church. See Lawson's "History of the Scottish Episcopal Church from the Revolution to the Present Time," p. 66, 67.—E.]

adducing the testimonies of single Presbyterian ministers witnessing for the honesty and integrity of the rabblers, or in opposition to the Prelatical relations. Thus, in White's case[1] (p. 32), he adduces five men testifying that the account of White's sufferings were false, &c.; and for the honesty of these five he tells us—"They have all their testimony from their minister that they are credible and famous witnesses." And, p. 105, he rejects Bullo's account, who was Episcopal minister of Stobo,[2] in one word, thus—"In this narrative are many lies, which is attested by Mr William Russell *(Presbyterian)* minister at Stobo. But the best is, after he had run down all the Prelatical accounts by this upright dealing of his, and concluded them all most horrid *liars* and *calumniators*, and all their Relations most horrid lies and calumnies, he tells you gravely in his Preface, § 6, that "the truth of matters of fact asserted in his book is not to be taken from him, but from his informers"—that "he pretends to personal knowledge of few of them"—that "therefore not his veracity, but theirs, is pledged for the truth of the *accounts he has published*"—that "if they have deceived him, or been deceived themselves, he is not to answer for it."

Let the world judge if this was not a *sure foot* for supporting such superstructures as he raised upon it, and if his "Second Vindication" is not a *pleasant book*. Was it possible for him to have *farced* it with more *barefaced* iniquities? What piqued the man so at his own book, as to publish it with so many fair evidences of disingenuity, partiality, effrontery, and downright ridiculousness about it? What could move him to treat his own brat with so little compassion? Was not this even in a literal sense *male natum exponere fœtum?* Or rather what meant *he* by treating *himself* so unmercifully? For who sees not that all the *infamy* terminates on the author in the *rebound?*

[1] [Mr White was minister of Ballantrae in the county of Ayr. He was struck on the face with the but-end of a musquet in his own house, another enthusiast attempted to run him through with a sword, and some others assaulted his wife, then far advanced in pregnancy. See Lawson's "History of the Scottish Episcopal Church from the Revolution to the Present Time," p. 67.– E.]

[2] [A parish in the county of Peebles and Diocese of Glasgow.– E.]

But, perchance, now that he is a profound philosophic *head* of a College, he may fall on a way to distinguish between his *own* and his *book's* credit; perchance he may think his *own* credit secure enough, whatever hazard his *books* may run. Well! He may try it if he will, but I would advise him not to be rash in falling out so with the book, for as sorry a book as it is. Yet I perceive that, with the assistance of a neighbour book, it can serve him a *trick* that may be sufficient to put even his *impudent self* a little out of countenance. I will be so kind to him as to let him see where the danger lies.

He may remember that the author of the "Second Letter," which, by the most probable calculation I can make, was written in December 1689 or January 1690, endeavoured to make it appear as probable, that the leading men in Government were then very much inclined to *justify* the *expulsion* of the clergy by the rabble, and sustain their churches *vacated* by that *expulsion*, and thereby cut off these poor men from all hopes of being restored to their churches or livings, though they had neither been convicted of any crime, nor deprived by any sentence. Now, there is another book, called "An Account of the late Establishment of Presbyterian Government by the Parliament, anno 1690,"[1] which gives a full and fair account how the thing was actually *done;* how the *expulsion* of the clergy by the rabble was actually *justified* by the same Act of Parliament which established Presbyterian government. If G[ilbert] R[ule] has not seen that book, or is resolved to reject its testimony because probably written by a *party*, I can refer him to the universal conviction of the whole nation that such a thing *was done* by that Act of Parliament. Nay, I can refer him to the Act of Parliament itself.[2]

That book tells also a shrewd story concerning a Presbyterian minister, called Mr Gilbert Rule, who preached a sermon before the Parliament on the 25th of May, being the Sunday before the Act was *voted* in the House; and before he published it, wrote a Preface to it, after the

[1] [This was written by Bishop Sage, and will appear in the present edition of his Works.—E.]

[2] [See Acta Parl. Scot. vol. ix.—E.]

Act was *voted*, in which he *thanked* the House very heartily for voting such an Act; and if G[ilbert] R[ule] distrusts that book, I refer him to *Mr Rule's* printed *Preface* to his sermon, where I am confident he may find satisfaction. Nay, I dare appeal to G[ilbert] R[ule] himself, if he knew not all these things to be true before he wrote one syllable of his "Second Vindication;" for these things were transacted every one of them before the middle of June 1690, and his "Second Vindication" came not abroad till more than a year after. Well! But what of all this? How can this assist G[ilbert] R[ule]'s *book* against *himself*, if it should be irritated to serve him a trick? Why, turn over to p. 43, 44, &c. and consider how it discovers in him such a *brawny impudence* as never ghost appearing in human shape was guilty of before him. For though the *Letter-man* was fully justified by the event—though what he said *seemed* to be intended by the Government, [and] appeared undeniably to have been intended by them in the execution—though they *justified* the *expulsion* of the clergy by the rabble as plainly and positively as an Act of Parliament could do it; so plainly and positively that the whole nation was sensible of it, and cried shame upon it; that some members in the very time resented it highly, calling it an indelible reproach upon the justice of the nation; that many members to this very minute will frankly acknowledge there was never greater or more notorious iniquity established by a Law.[1] Though

[1] [In supporting a petition from some of the unfortunate clergy, presented by Sir Patrick Scott of Ancrum, the Duke of Hamilton, in reply to a pretence that they had *deserted* their parishes, thus indignantly addressed the Parliament—"It was wonderful to call these men *deserters*, when it was notorious all the kingdom over that they were driven away by the most barbarous violence; and it was no less wonderful to declare their churches vacant, because of their being removed from them. For what could be the sense of the word *removed*, in this case, but neither more nor less than *rabbled*, and what might the world think of the justice of the Parliament, if it should sustain that as a sufficient ground for declaring the churches vacant?" The Duke farther emphatically stated that he was "sorry he had ever sat in a Scottish Parliament where such iniquity was to be established into a law—that it was impossible Presbyterian government could stand, being built on such a foundation; and it grieved him to the heart to consider what a reflection this Act would bring upon the Government, and justice of the House." His Grace immediately retired, and was accompanied by several members. Soon afterwards the Duke of Queensberry, the Earls of Linlithgow and Balcarres, and many

G[ilbert] R[ule] knew it so well, and was so much pleased with it, that he thanked the Parliament with all his soul for it, telling them—"He and his party were filled with joy while they beheld the religious regard which the High and Honourable Court of Parliament had showed to the mountain of the Lord's House above other mountains, in the great step towards the establishing thereof that they had made by their vote"—(whereof that justification of the rabble was a great part): Though he prayed "that the Lord would reward them for their good deeds"—(whereof this was one)—"towards his House:" Though all these things were and are clear as the light, and uncontroulable as matter of fact can be, yet G[ilbert] R[ule] lashed the *Letter-man* till he almost *flayed* him, made him a "railer," one who "understood" no "logic," a "strainer at silly quibbles," one who had an extraordinary dose of "brow," and whose "wit was a wool-gathering," &c.; and all this for telling this plain truth, that the Government had a design to justify the expulsion of the clergy by the rabble.

Thus, I think, I have made it appear how little tender G[ilbert] R[ule] was even of his own beloved self, when he was straitened in his argument. I might have easily adduced more instances, but the truth is I am now very weary of him; and he himself has done himself the justice to represent himself to any man's satisfaction who shall not be satisfied with the representation I have given of him; for he hath fairly owned that he sets himself in opposition to those whom he acknowledges to be the *soberest* and *wisest* of his party. I do not love to be unjust to him. I will give it you in his own words, as I find them [in his] "First Vindication," Answer to Question 5, § 6.

He was complaining of the persecutions his party had met with for keeping *conventicles*, &c., and amongst other things he discourses thus—"There might have been some shadow for such severity against meeting"—(at field-conventicles)—"with arms, though even that was in some cases necessary; but this was always disallowed by the soberest and wisest

gentlemen, withdrew. See Acta Parl. Scot. vol. ix. p. 131, 133. Skinner's Ecclesiastical History of Scotland, vol. ii. p. 548-550. Lawson's History of the Scottish Episcopal Church from the Revolution to the Present Time, p. 106, 107.—E.]

Presbyterians." Now, it is plain there are here these two affirmatives. 1. That "meeting with arms at field-conventicles was in some cases necessary." This is our author's sentiment. 2. That "meeting with arms at field-conventicles was always disallowed by the soberest and wisest Presbyterians." This, I say, he plainly affirms to have been always the sentiment of the *soberest* and *wisest*. By consequence, are not both these affirmatives joined together *equipollent* to this *complex* proposition—"Though the soberest and wisest Presbyterians did always disallow of meeting with arms, &c., yet in my judgment it was sometimes necessary?" And now, have you not from his own *friendly* self a *fair* demonstration of his own *folly* and *futility?* For who but a *futile fool* would have said that he differed in his sentiments from the *soberest* and *wisest?* And now to bring all home to my original purpose. By this time, I think, I have given reason enough for my refusing to accept of him for an answerer of my book. No man on earth, I think, would willingly enter the lists with one who is so singular for four such *cardinal* talents. Though *incurable ignorance* and *incorrigible nonsense* may be something *pitiable*, as being the *vices* of nature rather than *choice*, yet it is no small *persecution* for one to be obliged to grapple with them. What must it be, then, to be committed with the other two—*rank ill-nature*, I mean, and the most *stubborn impudence?*

Some *ill-natures* may be *cured:* men may be either *cajoled* or *cudgeled* out of them. Agelastus[1] himself *laughed* once; so did [the] Duke d'Alva.[2] But what hopes can there be of

[1] [He was the grandfather of M. Lucinius Crassus the Rich, and was only known to have laughed upon one occasion, when he saw an ass eating thistles.—E.]

[2] [This Nobleman, born in 1508, was General of the Imperial Army, and Minister of State to Charles V. He was a person of fierce and unrelenting disposition, and being sent by his master to quell an insurrection in the Flemish provinces of his dominions, he practised the most unheard of cruelties towards his unhappy victims. In the "Zurich Letters" there is this contemporary notice of his proceedings—"The Duke of Alva is clearly acting the part of Phalaris among our Low-Country neighbours. For men, the rich especially, are daily dragged to execution without regard to any form of law," p. 208-9. He died at Lisbon in 1583, but it is not easy to discover to what particular event in his life allusion is here made. There is an anecdote, illustrative of his fierce and forbidding aspect, related by Campbell in his Court and Times of Frederick the Great, vol. ii.

one whose *common sense* is so intrinsically *vitiated*, that he can *avouch* the *coarsest* and most *scurrilous scolding* to be *excessive civility?* But this is not the worst of it. If there had been any thing *venust* or *lepid*, any shadow of *concinnity* or *festivity*, of *jollity* or *good humour*, any thing like *art*, or *life*, or *wit*, or *salt*, in any one of fifty of his *excessive civilities* —if they had had the least *tincture* of the *satire*—nay, if their *mien* had resembled so much as the *murgeons* of an *ape*, I could have pardoned him, and let his talent pass for *tolerable*. There is something delightful in *marvelism*, in *well humoured wantonness*, in *lively* and judicious *drollery*. There may be some *enormous strokes* of *beauty* in a *surprizing banter*—some *irregular sweetness* in a *well cooked bitterness*. But who can think on drinking nothing but *corrupted vinegar?* What human patience can be hardy enough for entering the lists with *pure barking* and *whining* — with *original dullness?* Who can think on arming himself against the *horns* of a *snail*, or setting a *match* for *mewing* with a *melancholy cat?* But what can be said of his *impudence*—his *master-talent?* Why, to tell the truth of it, I am not able to define it, and so I must let it alone. I know nothing in nature like it. It is too hard for all the ideas or words I am master of. Were I to talk any more of it, I should design it his *undefinable attribute*.

And now I think our author may be sensible that it is not a *good* thing to cast a *bad* copy to the world, lest some for curiosity try if they can imitate it. For my part I do acknowledge that I have crossed my temper to make an experiment, if it was possible to be *even* with him—to let him see that others, as well as he, if they set themselves for it, may aim at least at "*arguing the case cuttingly*," as he phrases it, Preface to "Second Vindication," § 6.

One thing I am sure of—I have been faithful in my citations from his books, and I am not conscious that I have so

p. 261. To scare strangers away, and hinder them from breaking in upon his retreat of Sans Souci, Frederick "had a bust of the Duke of Alva, a hideous and repulsive caricature, set up on a pillar of porphyry, six feet high, close to the bridge in the garden leading to the basin and terrace of little Sans Souci, 'That,' as he once said to Lucchesini, 'strangers who might be tempted to encroach on my domain may be frightened away by the Duke's ugly face, and turn back.'"—E.]

much as *once* forced an *unnatural* sense on his words. For this I am satisfied, that what I have said [may] be tried with the greatest and most impartial accuracy. But if he is such an author as I have truly represented him to be, I hope the world will allow that I *had* and still *have* reason to refuse to have any dealing with him. Nay farther, I think it is nothing for the honour or reputation of his party that he was ever employed to be the "*Vindicator*" of their *Kirk*. If they can employ any civil, discreet, ingenuous person to write for them, I shall be heartily satisfied; and for his encouragement I do promise, if he falls to my share, I shall treat him suitably. Nay, after all, if G[ilbert] R[ule] himself will lay aside such *qualities* as I have demonstrated adhere to him—if he will undertake to write with that *gravity* and *civility*, that *charity* and *modesty*, that *honesty* and *ingenuity*, which may be thought to become one of his *age* and *character*, I can as yet admit of him for my adversary, (for I think the party cannot assign me a *weaker* one), and I do hereby promise him an *equitable meeting*.

[The case of Mr Gellie, referred to, page 85, seems to have been a singularly hard one, inasmuch as he had complied with the terms of the new Government; and various representations and strong efforts were made to have him re-instated in his living, of which he had been maliciously and unjustly deprived. The following letters shew the respect in which he was held by his parishioners, and their opinion of his deprivation:—

"May it please your Lordship—We, your whole neighbour Heritors, concerned in the parish of Airth, considering the vacancy of our church through the removal of Mr Paul Gellie, our minister, by the rash deposition of *two* or *three* insignificant persons, and the great insolencies of the rabble thereupon, without law or order, in abusing and violently possessing the church, conceived ourselves obliged to entreat your Lordship to see what may be done for the redress and satisfaction of orderly people; and seeing we have nothing to object against the life or doctrine of our minister, who is *well-beloved* by the *whole body* of the parish, whose loyalty and painfulness in the ministry your Lordship knows, it is our earnest desire that you interpose your endeavour to get him re-possessed again in this church, if possible; in doing of which you may be instrumental for promoting the good of this place, and not only oblige the whole body of the parish, but particularly us." Signed by seven Heritors of the parish.

"*Barnton, October* 17, 1689.

"My Dear Lord.—Your Lordship knows how Mr Paul Gellie, your minister, has deported himself in his ministry at Airth, and has gained the affections of all the parish, except three or four of the very worst of them, and how he was removed from his charge upon the depositions of two flagitious fellows, who had resolved to damn themselves to get him out of his ministry. If your Lordship can get his case fairly represented, and him reponed to his charge, I hear that the whole Heritors and the most substantial tenants will take it as a singular favour; and albeit I have no interest, but as a tutor [curator] to Airth, I will esteem it for a singular kindness." Signed "Ro. Mylne."

The above letters were addressed to Lord E——ne, and are probably the "Testimonies" referred to in this place. This Lord E——ne appears to have been John Lord Erskine, who succeeded his father as eleventh Earl of Mar of the name of Erskine, and was the leader of the Enterprize of 1715.—E.]

THE ARTICLE.

THAT PRELACY, AND THE SUPERIORITY OF ANY OFFICE IN THE CHURCH ABOVE PRESBYTERS, IS, AND HATH BEEN, A GREAT AND INSUPPORTABLE GRIEVANCE AND TROUBLE TO THIS NATION, AND CONTRARY TO THE INCLINATIONS OF THE GENERALITY OF THE PEOPLE, EVER SINCE THE REFORMATION, THEY HAVING REFORMED FROM POPERY BY PRESBYTERS, AND THEREFORE OUGHT TO BE ABOLISHED.

THIS Article was established in our Claim of Right, April 11, 1689. By virtue of this Article, Prelacy was actually abolished by Act of Parliament, July 22, 1689. Upon the foot of this Article Presbyterian Government was established, June 7, anno 1690. This Act establishing Presbyterian Government was ratified in the whole heads, articles, and clauses thereof, June 12, 1693. It is indisputable, then, that this Article is the great foundation of that great alteration which hath been made in the government of the Church of Scotland since the beginning of the late Revolution. Whether, therefore, this is a *solid* or a *sandy* foundation cannot but be deemed a material question, and, I think, I shall bid fair for the determination of this question, if I can give clear and distinct satisfaction to these following Inquiries:—

I. Whether the Church of Scotland was reformed solely by persons cloathed with the character of *Presbyters?*

II. Whether our Scottish Reformers, whatever their characters were, were of the present Presbyterian principles?

Whether they were for the Divine institution of *Parity*, and the unlawfulness of *Prelacy*, amongst the pastors of the Church?

III. Whether Prelacy, and the superiority of any office in the Church, above Presbyters, was a great and insupportable grievance and trouble to this nation, and contrary to the inclinations of the generality of the people, ever since the Reformation?

IV. Whether it was *such* when this Article was established in the Claim of Right?

V. Whether, supposing the premises in the Article were true, they would be of sufficient force to infer the conclusion, viz. that Prelacy, and the superiority of any office in the Church, ought to be abolished?

The determination of the main question, I say, may competently result from a perspicuous discussion of these five Inquiries. And therefore I shall attempt it as fairly as I can, leaving to the world to judge equitably of my performance; and without further prefacing, I come to

THE FIRST INQUIRY.—*Whether the Church of Scotland was Reformed solely by persons cloathed with the character of Presbyters?*

If the framers of the Article meant that it was in these words—"They having reformed from Popery by Presbyters"—I think, I am pretty sure they meant amiss; for there is nothing more obvious to one who reads and compares our Histories, than that persons standing in other stations, and cloathed with other characters, had a very great hand, and were very considerable instruments in carrying on our Reformation.

Particularly, 1, There were *Prelates*[1] who concurred in

[1] [Of the ancient Hierarchy only four joined the Reforming party, who went over rather as *apostates*, than as Bishops, who, though they renounced the Papal jurisdiction, had no intention to perpetuate the apostolic government of the Church. Indeed two of them, James Hamilton, Bishop of Argyll, and Robert Stewart, Bishop of Caithness, had never been *solemnly* invested with the episcopate, or *consecrated*, being merely *Bishops-Elect*. The other two, Adam Bothwell of Orkney, and Alexander Gordon of Galloway, *were*

that work as well as *Presbyters*. Knox says there were present in the Parliament holden in August 1560, which Parliament gave the first national establishment to our Reformation, the Bishop of Galloway, the Abbots of Lindores, Culross, St Colm's Inch, Coldingham, St Mary-Isle, and the Sub-Prior of St Andrews, with diverse others; and of all these he says that "they had renounced Papistry, and openly professed Jesus Christ."[1] Spottiswoode reckons up no fewer than *eight* of the Spiritual Estate, all *Protestants*, chosen at that time to be Lords of the Articles, namely, the Bishops of Galloway and Argyll, the Prior of St Andrews, the Abbots of Aberbrothwick, Kilwinning, Lindores, Newbottle, and Culross.[2] Lay these two accounts together, and you shall have at least a *round dozen* of *Reforming Prelates*. It is true Spottiswoode says—"The Popish Prelates stormed *mightily* at such a nomination for the Articles, alleging that some of them were meer Laicks." But what if it was so? I am apt to think our Presbyterian brethren will not be *fond* to make much advantage of this. I am apt to think they will not say that all those whom they allow to have been *Reforming Presbyters*, were *duly* and *canonically* ordained:—that they were solemnly *separated* from the ministry, by such as had *commission* and *power* to *separate* them, and in such manner as had universally obtained, from the Apostles' times, in the *separation* of *Presbyters* for their holy functions.

The plain truth is, 2, our Reformation was principally carried on by such as neither *did* nor *could* pretend to be canonically promoted to Holy Orders. Knox himself[3] tells us, that when the Reformation began to make its more public advances, which was in the year 1558, there was a great scarcity of preachers. "At that time," says he, "we had no public ministers of the Word; only did certain zealous men (among whom were the Laird of Dun,[4] David

duly consecrated Prelates. The union of those two with the overthrowers of the ancient Hierarchy, and their having been recognised by the Reformers, and named in ecclesiastical documents of the period as *Bishops*, (see Booke of the Universall Kirk of Scotland, Part I. p. 32), sufficiently contradict the assertion in the "Claim of Right" that Scotland was "reformed from Popery soldly by Presbyters."—E.]

[1] Knox, 260. [2] Spottiswoode, 149. [3] Knox, 127.

[4] [John Erskine, a cadet of the Noble Family of Mar.—E.]

Forrest, Mr Robert Lockhart, Mr Robert Hamilton, William Harlaw, and others), exhort their brethren according to the gifts and graces granted to them; but shortly after did God stir up his servant Paul Methven[1]," &c. Here we have but a very diminutive account of them as to number, and such an account as, in its very *air* and *countenance*, seems to *own* they were generally but *Lay-Brethren*—they were but *zealous men*, not *canonically ordained Presbyters*. And if we may believe Lesly, Paul Methven was by occupation a *baker*, and William Harlaw a *tailor*.[2] The Laird of Dun that same very year was Provost of Montrose, and as such sent to France, as one representing not the first or the Spiritual, but the third Estate of Parliament, the Burroughs, to attend at the celebration of the Queen's marriage with the Dauphin of France.[3] He was indeed a gentleman of good esteem and quality, and he was afterwards a Superintendent, but it no where appears that he was ever received into Holy Orders.

Nay, 3, after the pacification at Leith, which was concluded in July 1560, when the ministers were distributed amongst the several towns, we find but a very small number of them. John Knox was appointed for Edinburgh, Christopher Goodman for St Andrews, Adam Heriot for Aberdeen, John Row for Perth, William Christison for Dundee, David Ferguson for Dunfermline, Paul Methven for Jedburgh, and Mr David Lindsay for Leith. Beside these, five were nominated to be Superintendents. Spottiswoode for Lothian and Merse, Winram for Fife, the Laird of Dun for Angus and Mearns, Willock for Glasgow, and Carsewell for Argyll and The Isles. These are all who are reckoned up by Knox and Spottiswoode.[4] And Spottiswoode adds—"With this small number was the plantation of the Church at first undertaken." And can we think, though all these had been *Presbyters duly ordained*, that they were the *only* men who carried on the Scottish Reformation?

Farther yet: 4, Petrie[5] tells us, that the first General

[1] [This person had a sad fall some years after, and being accused and convicted of gross immorality, fled into England, where he remained, and his descendants now occupy a high station.—E.]

[2] Lesly, 496. [3] Lesly, 494; Spottiswoode, 95.

[4] Knox, 259; Spottiswoode, 149. [5] Petrie, 222.

Assembly, which was holden in December 1560, consisted of forty-four persons; and I find exactly forty-four names recorded in my manuscript-extract of the Acts of the General Assemblies, as the names of the members of that Assembly; but of all these forty-four there were not above *nine* at most who were called *ministers*, so that at least more than *thirty* were but *Lay-Brethren*, according to the *then* way of *reckoning*. Probably they were generally such, if you speak in the dialect and reckon by the measures of the Catholic Church in all ages.

In short, 5, There is nothing more evident to any who considers the Histories of these times than that they were generally laymen who promoted our "violent and disordered Reformation," as Spottiswoode justly calls it.[1] And it is reasonable to think the sense of this was one argument which prevailed with our Reformers to declare against the ancient Catholic and Apostolic ceremony of imposition of hands in Ordinations,[2] as is to be seen in the Fourth Head of the First Book of Discipline,[3] and as is generally acknowledged.

Thus, I think, I have sufficiently deduced matters as to my First Inquiry. It had been easy to have insisted longer on it, but I had no inclination for it, considering that there is a kind of *piety* in *despatch*, when the longer one insists on a subject of this nature he must still the more expose the failures of our Reformation, and the weaknesses of our Reformers.[4] Proceed we now to

[1] Spottiswoode, 60.

[2] [Under the fourth head of the First Book of Discipline we find the following enactment—"Albeit the Apostles used the imposition of hands, yet seeing the miracle is ceased, the using of the ceremony we judge not to be necessary."—E.]

[3] Spottiswoode, 156.

[4] [We cannot sufficiently admire and endeavour to imitate the delicacy of feeling which caused our author to abstain from exposing the irregularities incident to the great moral revolution in Scotland in the sixteenth century, and the wanton boldness with which every principle of unity and every time-honoured usage was outraged and flung aside. It becomes us, while we deplore the means and principles by which, humanly speaking, the change was effected, to adore the wisdom and power of God, who hath worked good out of evil, and to be grateful to Him for having called us to the knowledge of "Evangelical Truth," and preserved to us a system of "Apostolical Order."—E.]

THE SECOND INQUIRY.—*Whether our Scottish Reformers, whatever their characters were, were of the present Presbyterian principles? Whether they were for the Divine Institution of Parity, and the unlawfulness of Prelacy amongst the Pastors of the Church?*

THIS Inquiry, if I mistake not, is pretty far in the interests of the main question. For the Article, as I am apt to take it, aims at this, that our Reformation was carried on with such a "dislike *to* Prelacy, or the superiority of any office in the Church above Presbyters, as *made* Prelacy, or such a superiority, ever since a great and insupportable grievance and trouble to this nation," &c. But if this is the sense of the Article, what else is it than that our Reformers were Presbyterians? But whether or not this was truly intended (as it is truly very hard to know what was intended) in the Article, this is certain—this Inquiry is material and pertinent, and if it *faces* not the Article *directly*, undoubtedly it doth it by *fair consequence*. It is as certain our Presbyterian brethren use with confidence enough to assert that our Reformers were of their principles. This is one of the main arguments by which they endeavour on all occasions to influence the populace, and gain proselytes to their party, and therefore I shall endeavour to go as near to the bottom of this matter as I can, and set it in its due light; and I hope it shall appear to be competently done to all who shall attentively and impartially weigh the following deduction.

And, 1. Let it be considered that while our Reformation was on the *wheel*, and for some years after its public establishment, there was no such controversy agitated in Europe as this, concerning *the Divine institution of parity or imparity amongst the pastors of the Church*.

The Pope's pretended universal Headship was called in question indeed; and, called in question, it was run down with all imaginable reason some years before the settlement of our Reformation That controversy was *one* of the *first* which were accurately ventilated by the patrons of Reformation. And it was very natural that it should have been so, considering what stress was laid upon it by the *Pontificians*.

It is likewise true that the corruptions of the Ecclesiastical

Estate were inquired into in most provinces, every where where the *truth* began to *dawn*, and the Reformation was encouraged; and it was not to be imagined but in such scrutinies Bishops would be taken notice of for their general defection from the ancient rules and measures of the Episcopal office, and the vast dissimilitude between them and those of the same Order in the Primitive times both as to the discharge of their trust and their way of living. And who doubts but in these things the Popish Bishops were too generally culpable?

It is farther true that some countries, when they reformed religion, and separated from the Church of Rome, did set up *new models* of government in the Churches they erected, as they thought their civil constitutions could best bear them; and having once set them up, what wonder if they did what they could to justify them, and maintain their lawfulness? Thus, for instance, Mr Calvin erected a *model* of the *democratical size* at Geneva, because that State had then cast itself into a *democracy*. And the Protestants in France, partly for conveniency, partly in imitation of Calvin's platform, fell upon a method of governing their Churches without Bishops, and so it fared with some other Churches, as in Switzerland, &c.; while in the meantime other Churches thought it enough for them to reform the doctrine and worship without altering the ancient form of government.

But, then, it is as evident as anything in history that all this while, from the first dawnings of the Reformation—I mean till some years after the public establishment of our Reformation—there was no such controversy insisted on by Protestants either in their debates with the Papists or with one another, as that about the *divine* and *unalterable institution of parity or imparity* amongst the pastors of the Church; and I dare confidently challenge my Presbyterian brethren to produce any *one Protestant Confession of Faith* for their side of the question. Nay more, I dare challenge them to instance any *one Protestant divine* of note who in these times maintained their side of the controversy—who maintained the *unlawfulness* of *imparity* amongst Christian pastors before Theodore Beza did it, *if he did it*. Sure I am they cannot, without the greatest impudence, pretend that Mr Calvin, the only trans-

marine divine I can find consulted by our Reformers about matters relating to our Reformation, was of their principles; for whoso shall be pleased to consult his Commentaries on the New Testament, particularly on 1 Cor. xi. 2, 3, or some chapters in the beginning of his Fourth Book of "Institutions," or his book about the "Necessity of Reforming the Church," or his Epistles, particularly his Epistle directed to the Protector of England, dated October 22, 1548; or to Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury;[1] to the Bishop of London;[2] to Ithavius, Bishop of Urladistavia,[3] dated December 1, anno 1558; or his resolution of that case,[4]—"If a Bishop or Curate join himself to the Church," &c.; or lastly, his Epistle to the King of Poland,[5] wherein he tells him that "it was nothing but pride and ambition that introduced the Pope's supremacy; that the ancient Church had indeed her Patriarchs and Primates for the expedition of discipline and the preservation of unity; as if in the kingdom of Poland one Archbishop should have the precedency of the rest of the Bishops, not that he might tyrannize over them, but for order's sake, and for cherishing unity amongst his colleagues and brethren; and next to him there should be provincial or city Bishops for keeping all things orderly in the Church. *Nature teaching*, says he, *that from every college one should be chosen who should have the chief management of affairs.*[6] But it is another thing for one man, as the Pope doth, to arrogate that to himself which exceeds all human abilities, namely, the power of governing the whole universe." Whoso shall perpend these writings of Mr Calvin's, I say, shall find that he was very far from maintaining the *unlawfulness* of *Prelacy*. Nay, farther yet; I challenge my Presbyterian brethren, upon

[1] Calv. Epist. Col. 134, 135.

[2] Col. 316.—[Edmund Grindal, afterwards Archbishop of York, and famous for his controversy with Queen Elizabeth about the "Prophesyings" (vide Grindal's Remains, published by the Parker Society, p. 376-90), in which place there is a spirited letter, in which the Archbishop asserts the distinction between civil and ecclesiastical power, and very plainly intimates to the Queen, that in her dealings with him she was overstepping the proper bounds of the royal prerogative.—E.]

[3] Calvini Opera. Ed. 1677, fol. 9, p. 131, tom. ix.

[4] Col. 466.

[5] Col. 190.

[6] Sicut hoc natura dictat, unum ex singulis Collegiis deligendum, cui præcipua cura incumbat.

their ingenuity, to tell me whether it was not a good many years after 1560 that Beza himself, the *true founder* of their *sect*, condemned Prelacy, *if he did condemn it.*

I say, *if he did maintain the necessity of parity, and condemned Prelacy*, for however he may seem upon several occasions, not only to give the preference to Presbyterian government, and represent it as the most eligible, but to endeavour to found it on Scripture, and represent Episcopacy as an human invention, yet I have not observed that anywhere he calls it *absolutely* or *simply unlawful.* On the contrary, he says in express terms that "it is tolerable when it is duly bounded—when the pure Canons of the ancient Church are kept in vigour to keep it within its proper limits."[1]

Sure I am he was not for separating from a Church, as our modern Presbyterians are, upon the account of its government being *Episcopal*, as might be made appear fully from his Letters; so that whatever greater degrees of *dislike* to Episcopacy he may have discovered beyond his predecessor Mr Calvin, yet it is not unreasonable to think that his great *aim* was no more than to justify the constitution of the Church he lived in, and recommend it as a pattern to other Churches.

The scope of this whole consideration is this, that if what I have asserted is true—if there was no such controversy agitated all the time our Church was a reforming, nor for a good many years after, then we have one fair presumption that our Reformers were not Presbyterians. It is not likely that they were for the indispensibility of parity, that being the side of a question which in these times was not begun to be tossed.

II. And this presumption will appear yet more ponderous, if it be considered that we have no reason to believe that our Reformers had any peculiar motives or occasions for adverting to the pretended evils of Prelacy, or any peculiar interests to determine them for *parity*, beyond other Churches; or that they were more sharp-sighted to espy faults in Prelacy, or had opportunities or inclinations to search more

[1] Humanus Episcopatus tolerabilis quidem esset, modo veteres puri Canones; impediendæ oligarchiæ constituti, in usum revocarentur. Beza in Resp. ad 1 Quæst. a Dom. Glam. Propositam.—[Beza's Reply to the first of the Questions proposed by Lord Glammis, Chancellor of Scotland.—E.]

diligently, or inquire more narrowly, into these matters than other Reformers. The truth is, the controversies about Doctrine and Worship were the great ones which took up the thoughts of our Reformers, and employed their most serious applications. This is obvious to any who considers the accounts we have of them—so very obvious, that G[ilbert] R[ule] himself fairly confesses it in his "First Vindication," ad Question 1, where he tells us that "the errors and idolatry of that way (meaning Popery) were so gross, and of such immediate hazard to the souls of people, that it is no wonder that our Reformers minded these first and mainly, and thought it a great step to get these removed; so that they took some more time to consult about the reforming of the government of the Church." From which, it is plain, he confesses the Reformation of the Church's government was not the subject of their *main thinking*, which indeed is very true, and cannot but appear to be so to any who considers what a *lame* scheme was then *dressed* up by them. But however this was, it is enough to my present purpose that our Reformers were more employed in reforming the Doctrine and Worship than in thinking about Church governments; from which, together with the former presumption, which was, that our present controversies were not begun to be agitated in these times, one of two things must follow unavoidably, viz. either, 1. That if they were for the *divine* and *indispensible right* of *parity*, it is no great matter; their authority is not much to be valued in a question about which they had *thought* so little: or, 2, That it is to be presumed they were *not* for the *divine right* of *parity*, that being the side of a question which was not then agitated in any Protestant Church, and as little in Scotland as any. To be ingenuous, I think both inferences good, though it is only the last I am concerned for at present.

III. But this is not all, for, so far as my opportunities would allow me, I have had a special eye on all our Reformers as I found them in our Histories. I have noticed their sentiments about Church government as carefully as I could, and I have not found so much as one amongst them who hath, either *directly* or *indirectly*, asserted the *divine* and *unalterable right of parity*.

By our *Reformers* here I mean such as were either, 1, *Martyrs;* or, 2, *Confessors* for the Reformed religion before it had the countenance of civil authority; or, 3, such as lived when it was publicly established, and had a hand in bringing it to that perfection. Such, I think, and such only, deserved the name of our Reformers. And here, again, I dare be bold to challenge my Presbyterian brethren to adduce clear and plain proof that so much as any *one man* of the *whole number* of our Reformers was of the *present* principles of the *party*.

Some of them, indeed, seem to have laid great *stress* on *Holy Orders*, and to have been of opinion that *personal gifts* and *graces* were a sufficient *call* to any man to preach the gospel, and undertake the pastoral office. Thus, that excellent person, Mr George Wishart, who in most things seems to have juster notions of the gospel spirit than most of our other Reformers,[1] when at his trial he was charged

[1] [The historical reader of these days cannot but demur to this encomium on George Wishart, upon whose memory certain writers have been accustomed to bestow more praise than modern research will allow us to believe that he deserved. It is true he was brought to the stake by Cardinal Beaton after a very summary and unfair trial, and that he sustained the agonies of a cruel death with heroic fortitude. It is true that he preached against the "errors of Romanism," and accused the clergy of being guilty of shameless licentiousness; but neither his conduct at the stake, nor his opposition to the Church of Rome, nor his freedom from the prevailing vices of the times, can *gild* the deformity which attaches to his character, from his having been not merely the *intimate associate* of the murderers of Beaton, but the *agent* whom they employed to barter away the life of that Prelate, not for the sake of *religion*, but for the sordid purpose of *gaining English gold* as the reward of their diabolical assassination. Let Beaton have been as bad as possible, and as great an enemy to the cause of the Reformation as his bitterest enemies have represented him, it is plain that those who afterwards murdered him, *perhaps because he had caused their friend to be condemned*, would two years before, if Henry VIII. had accepted their offer, have made him the victim of English *political* intrigue; and that Wishart *at least* concurred with them, and even forwarded their dark designs. Very probably it was the *knowledge of Wishart's participation in such a conspiracy against his life*, more than his heretical opinions, which stirred up the vengeance of the Cardinal against him, and brought him to an untimely end. At all events, with such details before us, we cannot admit that his notions of the gospel were more correct than those of his neighbours, and cannot without most painful misgivings permit him to be reckoned among "the noble army of martyrs"—See Tytler, vol. v. p. 343, 344. "Historical Remarks on the Assassination of Cardinal Beaton" appended to vol. v. Lyon's History of St Andrews, vol. ii. Appendix, p. 358-66. In the latter

with this Article—"That every man was a priest, and that the Pope had no more power than another man," answered to this purpose—"That St John saith of all Christians, He hath made us kings and priests; and St Peter, He hath made us a kingly priesthood: That, therefore, any man skilled in the Word of God and true faith of Christ had power given him of God; but he that was unlearned, and not exercised in the Word of God, nor constant in the faith, whatever his state or order was, had no power to bind or to loose, seeing he wanted the Word of God, which is the instrument of binding and loosing."[1] And it is probable this was a prevailing opinion in those times, from the too common practice of it. But hath this any relation to the divine right of parity? Doth it not strike equally against *both Orders*, that of *Presbyters* as well as that of *Bishops?* Is it not plainly to set up the *jus laicorum sacerdotale* in opposition to both; and who can say but this opinion might have been in a *breast* which entertained no scruples about the lawfulness of Episcopacy? No doubt it might, and no doubt it was actually so with this same holy *martyr*; for he was not only willing that the *then* Bishops, though *Popish*, should be his judges; he not only gave them still their *titles*, and paid them all the respect that was due to their Order and character—homages infinitely scandalous with our modern Presbyterians—as is to be observed through all the steps of his trial, but in his last exhortation to the people, at the very stake, he bespake them thus—"I beseech you, brethren and sisters, to exhort your Prelates to the learning of the Word of God, that they may be ashamed to do evil and learn to do good; and if they will not convert themselves from their wicked errors, there shall hastily come upon them the wrath of God, which they shall not eschew."[2]

Here you see the *dying martyr* was earnest that the Popish Prelates might quit their *errors*, not their *prelations*. What is there here that looks like a *divine-right-of-parity-*

work there is a compendious account of the evidence on this recently discovered point, and the arguments for and against Wishart's guilt in the conspiracy to murder the Cardinal are fairly and dispassionately discussed by the learned writer.—E.]

[1] Knox, 64. [2] Knox, 70.

man? Indeed he was none of that *principle.* He had had his principles from England, as we shall find hereafter. Only one thing more about him here. He was not for *club-law* Reformations—he was neither for violent possessions of churches, nor for propagating the *cause* by *rabbles*, if we may believe Knox's accounts of him.

Others, again, of our Reformers, declaimed loudly against the Bishops of these times, and condemned them severely, and perhaps too deservedly. But what is this to the *Order?* Doth every man condemn the *office* who condemns this or that *officer?* If so, then sure the *Order of Presbyters* was as bad as the *Order* of *Bishops* in the judgment of our Reformers. For instance, hear Walter Mill in his exhortation to the people at his martyrdom—" Therefore as ye would escape eternal death, be no more seduced with the lies of"—*(whom? of Bishops only? no, but of the whole collection of)*—" the Priests, Abbots, Monks, Friars, Priors, Bishops, and the rest of the sect of Antichrist."[1] But it is needless to adduce the testimonies of private persons. We have the public *deeds* of the Protestants of these times very clear to this purpose. Thus, they directed a declaration of their minds to the *Popish clergy* under this title—" To the Generation of Antichrist, the pestilent Prelates, and their Shavelings within Scotland," &c.[2] And were not *Presbyters* of the number of these *shavelings?* And what can be more *patt* to this purpose than the Supplication which was presented by our Reformers to the Parliament, anno 1560? There they tell the Estates that " they cannot cease to crave of their Honours the redress of such enormities as manifestly are, and of a long time have been, committed by the place-holders of the ministry and others of the clergy.—They offer evidently to prove that in all the rabble of the clergy there is not one lawful minister;—and therefore they crave that they may be deemed unworthy of honour, authority, charge, or care, in the Church of God," &c.[3] Whoso pleases may see more of their public representations to this effect in Knox's " History."[4] Now, what can be more clear than that all this work was against *Presbyters* as much as against

[1] Spottiswoode, 96. [2] Knox, 146. [3] Knox, 260.
[4] P. 135 and 143.

Bishops, and by consequence against *both offices*, or against *neither?* as, indeed, it was against *neither*, as I shall afterwards demonstrate from this same petition. In short, nothing can be more evident to an attentive reader than that in all these *efforts* of the *zeal* of our Reformers against the *Popish Bishops*, it was only the *Popery*, and not at all the *Prelacy*, that was aimed at. They never condemned *Bishops* as *Bishops*, but only as *Popish Bishops*.

I have insisted the more largely on these things, because I know people are apt to mistake in this matter who do not sufficiently attend to the *dialect* of these *times*, especially when they read the "History" which is commonly called John Knox's. I return now to my purpose, and repeat my assertion, viz.—That our Presbyterian brethren cannot adduce so much as *one* of our martyrs, our confessors, or those who had any *remarkable hand* in the establishment of our Reformation in the year 1560, who was of the *modern Presbyterian principles*.

Three authors have indeed attempted it—the author of the pamphlet entituled "The Course of Conformity," Mr Calderwood, and Mr Petrie.

The author of the "Course of Conformity," in his Fourth Chapter, reckons up a full *dozen* of such, as he says, gave "*evident and full testimony against Bishoprie*," as he calls it. But he has not recorded the testimony of any *one* except Knox. All the rest he proves to have been enemies to Prelacy by this one argument—"They preached zealously against Popery, and Bishopric is one of the greatest errors and corruptions of that." He neither offers at *proving* his *subsumption*, nor at adducing any other topic. And has he not proven the point demonstratively? Besides, some of his *dozen* were not heard of till several years after the Reformation, and so cannot be brought in *bar* against my challenge.

Further, he has had the ill luck to name such for the half of his *dozen* as would have *laughed heartily* to have heard themselves cited as patrons of the *divine right of parity*, particularly Mr Willock, who lived and died Superintendent of Glasgow; Mr Pont, who died Bishop of Caithness[1]; Mr

[1] [Bishop Sage is incorrect in this assertion. Pont never was even a

Row, who was one of the *three* who stood for the *lawfulness of Episcopacy*, when it was first called in question at the Assembly in August 1575;[1] Mr Craig, whom Calderwood himself censures severely for his forwardness to have the brethren subscribe—"that they should give obedience to their Ordinaries," and charges with making *bitter invectives* against the "*sincerer sort*," as he calls the *Non Subscribers*.[2] I may add Mr Knox, as shall be made appear by and by. But I have taken but too much notice of "The Course of Conformity,"[3] which is truly one of the weakest pamphlets was ever seen in print; and if that part of it which is against Episcopacy was written by Mr James Melville, as Calderwood affirms,[4] it is a demonstration that whatever his *zeal* was against *Prelacy*, it was not according to *much knowledge*.

Mr Petrie mentions only two of our Reformers as *divine-right-of-parity-men*—the Earl of Moray, who was Regent, and Mr Knox. Calderwood insists on Knox, but doth not mention Moray.

Petrie's[5] evidence about Moray is, that he hath read of him, that by his letter he did inform Queen Elizabeth of the honour and happiness that would attend her Crown and

Titular or Tulchan. The See of Caithness had been offered to him by James VI., 1587, and he would have willingly accepted it, but was prevented by the General Assembly. Pont died in 1608. Gladstanes was appointed to Caithness in 1600, and held the See until his translation to St Andrews in 1606, in which year Alexander Forbes, minister of Fettercairn in Kincardineshire, succeeded to the vacant Diocese, and retained it till long after the death of Mr Pont. Booke of the Universall Kirk of Scotland, Part II., p. 696-7. Keith's Catalogue—See of Caithness, Reformation.—E.]

[1] Spottiswoode, 275; Calderwood, 69. [2] Calderwood, 167, 171, 187.

[3] [James VI. had resolved, when he ascended the throne of England, to permit the Bishops of that country to consecrate Bishops for his ancient subjects, who had now been for half a century "as sheep without shepherds;" and in the Parliament which was held at Perth in 1606, an Act was passed preparatory to the restoration of the apostolical succession to Scotland. Against this a protest was made by several of the more violent Presbyterians, *some of whom, by the way, became Episcopalians afterwards;* and various reasons were assigned why Episcopacy should not be restored. Among other things the King was reminded of the fate of Hiel, the Bethelite, who re-edified Jericho, the city which the Lord had destroyed; and several sweeping assertions were made which the Protesters professed themselves able to substantiate. It was in verification of "these things offered to be proved," that the book called "The Course of Conformity" was written. Calderwood, p. 532.—E.]

[4] Calderwood, 536. [5] Petrie, 366.

State upon the establishment of Christ's government, and of the profitable uses whereunto the rich benefices of Bishops might be applied. But, 1, He tells not in what author he read this; and none who knows Mr Petrie's *bias* will think it unreasonable to *require* some other thing to *rely* on than his own *bare* authority. 2. If we should rest on his authority, and allow that Moray wrote so, because Mr Petrie said it, yet how will it follow that his Lordship was for the *divine right* of *parity?* Might not he have been against the temporal dignities and the rich benefices of the English Bishops without being against *Prelacy?* How many have been so? Indeed, 3, there is all the reason in the world to believe, that if Moray did write so to the English Queen, this was all he aimed at. For had he been for the *divine right* of *parity*, would he ever have so much countenanced *imparity* in the Church of Scotland? Was not he one of the subscribers of the First Book of Discipline,[1] wherein *imparity* was so formally established? Was not he Regent in December 1567, and did not he then give the royal assent to some Acts of Parliament made clearly in *favour* of imparity? Or did he extend the royal assent to these Acts in despight of his conscience?

It is true, indeed, time has been when some men have had such ductile consciences,[2] that piequed the one year for not having so much favour at Court as they thought they deserved, they could boldly stand up in Parliaments against iniquitous laws, and tell their fellow members that such laws reflected on the justice of the nation, and what not? And yet the next year, when the Court smiled on them, and gave them preferments and pensions to satisfy their

[1] Knox, 283; Spottiswoode, 175.

[2] [The sharp rebuke contained in this passage seems to have been pointed at the glaring inconsistency of the Presbyterians, who were "loud in their wail" against the penal laws before the Revolution, when they themselves groaned under their galling yoke. But after the overthrow of the Stuart Dynasty, and the ascendency of *their* cause, the ills which they had endured, and which should have caused them to sympathize with their neighbours under similar circumstances, were forgotten; and instead of *repressing*, we have too good reason for believing that they *acquiesced* with the fanatical mob who "rabbled" the Episcopal clergy from their livings, and *instigated* a jealous Government to practice unnecessary intolerance and severity towards the members of the newly disestablished Church.— E.]

ambition or their avarice, they could retract all their former *niceness* so much, that if they had got the management of the royal assent, they would have made no scruple to have applied it for the ratification, approbation, and perpetual confirmation of the same laws, in their whole heads, articles, and clauses, which seemed to themselves so *scandalous* and *wicked*. But the Earl of Moray, while Regent, had no such temptations. I believe he had no such *yielding* conscience. If he had, I do not think his authority was much to be valued. Once more: I think it is very strange that he should have been for the *Divine right* of *parity*, and yet should never have spoken so much *out*, considering his occasions, except in his private letters to Queen Elizabeth.

The only person now to be considered is John Knox. He was certainly a *prime* instrument in the advancement of our Reformation. His authority was great, and his sentiments were very influential; and it is not to be denied but it is of some weight in the present question to know what was his judgment. I shall, therefore, endeavour to account for his principles a little more fully, and I shall do it by these steps—1. I shall shew the insufficiency of the arguments that are adduced by our brethren to prove him Presbyterian. 2. I shall adduce the arguments which incline me to think he was not.

The great argument insisted on by the author of the "Course of Conformity," and Mr Petrie,[1] is taken from a letter of Knox's, directed to the General Assembly holden at Stirling in August 1571. The words are these—"Unfaithful and traitors to the flocks shall ye be before the Lord Jesus, if that, with your consent, directly or indirectly, ye suffer unworthy men to be thrust in within the ministry of the Kirk, under what pretence that ever it be. Remember the Judge before whom ye must make an account, and resist that TYRANNY as ye would avoid hell fire." So the author of the "Course of Conformity," without the least attempt to let the world see where the argument lay. Mr Petrie is indeed a little more discreet. He tells us where it lies. "John Knox, in his letter to the Assembly, by the word *tyranny* meaneth *Episcopacy*." So he, but without

[1] "Course of Conformity," p. 32; Petrie, p. 375.

any fuller deduction. And is not this a demonstration that Knox was Presbyterian? And yet, after all this, it is not possible to make more of the letter, when it is narrowly considered, than that Knox deemed it a pernicious and tyrannical thing for any person or persons whatsoever to thrust unworthy men into the ministry of the Church; and ministers, who would make conscience of their calling and trust, must resist such encroachments with all possible concern and courage. No man, I say, can make more of the letter. And who doubts but Mr Knox was so far in the right? But, then, let any man who looks not through Mr Petrie's spectacles, tell me what this has to do with *parity* or *imparity?*

The next argument is insisted on both by Petrie and Calderwood.[1] It is, that Knox was at St Andrews in February 1571-2, when Douglas was advanced to that See—that he refused to inaugurate him—nay, that in the audience of many then present he denounced *Anathema* to the *giver*, and *Anathema* to the *receiver;* and if you ask Calderwood's evidence for this, he tells you he found it in a *certain manuscript*, than which what can be more apodectic? To be short, though we had reason to give credit to Calderwood and his uncertain *certain manuscript*, and to believe that the matter of fact is true, and that Knox said and did so, yet by what consequences will it follow that he was for the *Divine right* of *parity?* To deal frankly, it is like enough that Knox said so, and it is very probable he had reason to say so in that instance; for at that time dreadful invasions were made upon the patrimony of the Church. None more deep in that iniquity than the Earl of Morton, then Chancellor, by whose influence Douglas was preferred to that Archbishopric. And so it is like enough that Knox, who all his life, was singularly zealous for the *rights* of the *Church*, upon suspicion, if not certain knowledge, of some *dirty bargain* between Morton and Douglas,[2] expressed suitable

[1] Petrie, 374; Calderwood, 55.

[2] [The Earl of Morton had received a grant of the revenues of the Archiepiscopal See of St Andrews from the then Regent; and when he heard of the plan of instituting the Tulchan Bishops, he naturally became anxious about the serious loss which he was likely to sustain by the filling up of the See, and set himself about devising means by which such a calamity might be averted. He resolved, therefore, to procure the

resentments. But that it was not from any persuasion he had of the *unlawfulness* of *Prelacy* is clear, even from what Calderwood and Petrie themselves have recorded within a page or two.[1] For both tell us, that when the next Assembly continued Douglas in the Rectorate of the University of St Andrews—a station he had been in before he was raised to the Archbishopric, John Knox regretted that so many offices were laid on one old man which scarcely twenty, of the best gifts, were able to bear. For, as Petrie adds—"He was now Archbishop, Rector of the University, and Provost of the New College of St Andrews." From this, I say, it is plain that Knox did not resent Douglas's advancement from any opinion of the *unlawfulness* of *Episcopacy*, for no such word was so much as once muttered by him, but from a persuasion he had that no one man was fit for such a multitude of offices. And I shall readily grant that Knox was not for *large Dioceses*, such as St Andrews was then, as we shall learn by and bye, though, I am afraid, little to the comfort of my Presbyterian brethren. But I have not yet despatched the whole argument. It is said—"He refused to inaugurate the Bishop," Be it so; but may not the grounds I have

appointment for a relative of his own, with whom he probably thought he might make some bargain, although Douglas, at his spurious consecration, in answer to one of the usual questions, solemnly averred that there was no "simoniacal compact" between them; and it does not appear that his lynx-eyed enemies were ever afterwards able to detect one. His advancement, however, was extremely unpopular, and Knox was particularly strenuous in *his* opposition to it. But it was not the *office* to which the Reformer objected. He seems rather to have disapproved of the *man* on account of his age and infirmity, and of *the manner* by which he was raised to the See, by the will of the Regent against the wishes of the leaders of the Kirk. This view of Knox's refusal to inaugurate Douglas coincides exactly with the opinion of his friend Erskine of Dun, expressed to the Regent Marr in a written expostulation on the subject (Bannatyne's Memorialles, p. 197-8, 201). That it was not the office, to which Douglas was appointed, which raised objections in Knox's mind, is admitted by the candid and learned Dr George Cook—"That he was not influenced by the idea that Episcopacy was at variance with Scripture, is evident from the communication which he, within a few months, made to the Assembly at Perth, viz. his approval of the Convention of Leith, which introduced and established the Tulchan Episcopate; and from the part in the ceremony taken by the Superintendant of Fife (Winram), one of his confidential friends."—Cook's History of the Church of Scotland, p. 188.—E.]

[1] Calderwood, 57; Petrie, 375.

laid down already make it reasonable for him to have done so, though he had no quarrel with *imparity?* What an argument is this—*John Knox, a Presbyter, refused to consecrate a Bishop*—ergo, *he was a Presbyterian!* This is upon the supposition that Calderwood and Mr Petrie have told us true matter of fact. And yet, I must confess, I see not the probability of its being true that Knox was desired to *inaugurate* him; for how is it imaginable that he would be desired to perform that office when there was a *Bishop* and a *Superintendent* at hand to do it, and who actually did it, as both authors acknowledge?

But that is not all. There is another argument insisted on by both authors,[1] viz. that "Mr John Rutherford, Provost of the Old College, alleged that Mr Knox's repining proceeded from malcontentment;" and "Knox purged himself next Sunday, saying, I have refused a greater Bishoprick than ever it was, which I might have had with the favour of greater men than he hath his; I did and do repine for the discharge of my conscience." Now, what more is there in all this than that Knox's conscience would not have allowed him to take a Bishoprick, with so much prejudice to the rights of the Church for any man's feud or favour, as he suspected Douglas had done in compliance with the Earl of Morton? Can the world see anything here that looked like the *Divine right* of *parity?* But Calderwood has yet a more wonderful argument[2] to prove Mr Knox one of his party. Mr Beza, forsooth, "being informed by Mr Knox, as appeareth, of the intention of the Court to introduce Bishops, wrote a letter to him, wherein he told him that as Bishops brought in the Papacy, so false Bishops, the relicts of Popery, would bring in Epicurism to the world, and therefore prayed him that Episcopacy might never be re-admitted into Scotland," &c. Petrie, indeed, mentions the same letter, but he had not the courage, it seems, to say that it appeared to have been occasioned by a letter of Knox to Beza, concerning the intentions of the Court to introduce Episcopacy. Indeed, no such thing appeareth from any sentence, phrase, or syllable in all Mr Beza's letter. How it came to *appear* to Mr Calderwood, whether by some *certain* or *uncertain manuscript*,

[1] Calderwood, 56; Petrie, 375. [2] Calderwood, 57.

I know not; but however it was, make the supposition that Knox did write so to Beza, where is the consequence of the argument? And if he wrote not, and it is impossible to make it appear from Mr Beza's letter that he did, why was Calderwood at such pains to give the world a citation out of Beza's letter against Episcopacy? Was that a good proof that Knox was Presbyterian, that Beza sent him such a letter? The truth is, if anything can be collected from that letter concerning Knox's sentiments, it seems rather that he was for Prelacy. For Beza seems clearly to import that Knox needed to be *cautioned* against it, for thus he writes[1]—"One thing I would have you, my dear Knox, and your brethren to advert to, as being very obvious, it is, that as Bishops brought forth the Papacy," &c. But if Knox needed this commonitory, I think it is no great argument that he was *Presbyterian*, so much at least as Beza would have had him. But to do Mr Calderwood justice, he seems to have laid no great stress on this argument, and so I leave it. So much for the arguments insisted on to prove that Mr Knox was for *parity*. I come now to the arguments which incline me to think he was not.

When we are inquiring after one's sentiments about a point in controversy, it is not reasonable to build much on far-fetched consequences, or refine upon incidental sayings, which may be very frequently the results of negligence or inadvertency. It is not proper to fasten on indirect propositions, or snatch at this or that indeliberate phrase or expression, which might have dropt unwarily from his tongue or pen. Following such measures, we may easily strain men's words beyond their meaning, and make them speak nonsense or innumerable contradictions, when we have a mind for it. The solid measure is to weigh a man's deliberate and serious thoughts, if any where he has expressed them. To consider his reasonings when he treated directly on the controverted subjects, or anything that stands so nearly related to it, that one cannot readily discourse the one without reflecting on the other; to trace him through

[1] Sed et istud, M. Knox, te cæterosque; fratres velim meminisse, quod jam oculis pene ipsis obversatur, sicut Episcopi papatum pepererunt, &c. Beza, Epis. 79, page 315.

his life if the controverted point is relative to practice, and try what was his behaviour when he had occasion to declare his mind concerning the matter in question—this, as I take it, is the *true rule*. Now, allowing this rule to take place, I am very much mistaken if Knox shall be found to have been for the *Divine institution* of *parity*, and the *unlawfulness* of *Prelacy*. Had he been so persuaded, how seasonable had it been for him to have spoken out so much when he was brought before King Edward's Council?[1] The question was then put to him,—"Whether he thought that no Christian might serve in the ecclesiastical ministration according to the rites and laws of the realm of England?" Here was a proper opportunity for him to have declared himself against *Prelacy*, if he had been really against it. How natural had it been for a *sincere parity man*, on that occasion, to have told that Council that no Christian could then serve with a safe conscience as a pastor of the Church of England, because, according to the laws of that realm, he behoved to serve as a member of an *unlawful Hierarchy?* Yet he answered nothing but that "no minister in England had authority to separate the lepers from the whole, which was a chief part of his office"—plainly founding all the *unlawfulness* of being a pastor of the Church of England, not on the *unlawfulness* of the *Hierarchy*, which he spoke not one word about, but on the *King's retaining* in his own hands the *chief power* of ecclesiastical discipline, as it is known he did.

When was it more opportune for him to have expressed these sentiments, if he had them, than when he was at Frankfort? Yet not one word of the *Divine right of parity*, or the *unlawfulness of Prelacy*, in all these controversies.[2] He was *warm* enough then, and *eager* enough, to have found faults in the English constitution, yet he never charged her with the *horrid guilt* of *Prelacy*. Not so much as one word of that in any account I have seen of these troubles. How suitable had it been for him to have declared himself in this

[1] Life of Knox; Calderwood, p. 3.

[2] Knox's Life; Knox's History, 102; Heylin's History of the Reformation; Burnet's History of the Reformation; Calderwood, 3; Calv. Ep.; Stillingfleet's "Unreasonableness of Separation," Part I. sect. 3.

matter in his "Appellation from the cruel and most unjust Sentence pronounced against him by the false Bishops and Clergy of Scotland" as he calls them, published by himself anno 1558? Yet in all that "Appellation" not one syllable to this purpose. On the contrary, he plainly *supposes* the *lawfulness* of the *Episcopal office* all along throughout it. He appeals to a lawful General Council[1]—"such a Council as the most ancient laws and canons do approve." And who knows not that the most ancient laws and canons made Bishops the *chief* if not the *only* members of such Councils? He says[2] if the Popish clergy, his adversaries, are for it, he is "content that matters in controversy between him and them be determined by the testimonies and authorities of Doctors and Councils," three things being granted him, whereof these are two—"1. That the most ancient Councils, nearest to the Primitive Church, in which the learned and godly Fathers examined all matters by God's word, may be holden of most authority. 2. That no determinations of Councils nor men be admitted against the plain verity of God's word, nor against the determinations of the four chief Councils." Would he, if he had been Presbyterian, have agreed so frankly to have stood by the determination of these four chief Councils? Could he have expected they would have favoured the *Divine right* of *Presbyterian parity?* Will any Scottish Presbyterian now-a-days stand to the decision of these four Councils? Farther, in that same "Appellation,"[3] he requires of the Nobility that "the Bishops be compelled to make answer for the neglecting their office, which plainly *supposes* the *lawfulness* of the *office*, and charges *guilt* only on the *officers*.

When had it been more seasonable than in his "Admonition to the Commonalty of Scotland," published, also, anno 1558? His great design in it was to excite them to a Reformation, by loading the *Papistical clergy* with every thing that was *abominable*. Yet not a syllable of it here neither; nothing but a farther and a clearer supposition of the *lawfulness* of *Prelacy*. "You may," says he,[4] "in a peaceable manner, without sedition, withhold the fruits and profits which your false Bishops and clergy most unjustly receive

[1] Page 2. [2] Page 32. [3] Page 3, 32. [4] Page 40.

of you, until such time as they shall faithfully do their charge and duties, which is to preach unto you Christ Jesus truly; rightly to minister the Sacraments according to his institution; and so to watch for your souls, as is commanded by Christ," &c. If this supposes not the innocency of the Episcopal office in itself, I know not what can. Had he been for the *Divine right* of *parity*, how *unfaithful* had he been in his "Faithful Admonition to the true Professors of the Gospel of Christ within the Kingdom of England," written anno 1554? His great work there was to enumerate the *causes* which in God's righteous judgment brought Queen Mary's persecution on them, but he quite forgot to name the *sin* of *Prelacy* as one. Assuredly he had not done so had he been of the same sentiments with our famous General Assembly 1690.[1] How *unfaithfully* was it done of him, I say, thus to *conceal* one of the most *crimson guilts* of the nation? But this is not the worst of it. In that same "Admonition," he has a most *scandalous* expression; sure he was not then sufficiently *purged* of *Popish corruption!* "God gives," says he, "such strength to that REVEREND FATHER IN GOD, Thomas Cranmer, to cut the knots of devilish sophistry," &c.[2] To call an Archbishop a *Reverend Father in God*, what was it else but *the plain language of the Beast?* How *rankly* did it *smell* of the *whore?*

How seasonable had it been in his letter to the Queen-Regent of Scotland, written anno 1556, and published by himself with additions, anno 1558? He talked very freely about the Popish Bishops in it, but never a tittle of the *unlawfulness* of the office. It is plain from that letter he never dreamed of the *doughty* argument so much insisted on since against Prelacy, viz. "That it is a branch of Popery, and Bishops are limbs of Antichrist." For having stated it as one of the Popish arguments[3] that "their religion was ancient, and it was not possible that that religion could be false which so long time, so many Councils, and so great a multitude of men, had authorized and confirmed," he gives his answer thus—"If antiquity of time shall be considered in such cases, then shall not only the idolatry of the Gentiles but also the false religion of Mahomet be preferred

[1] See Act for a National Fast. [2] Page 51. [3] P. 90.

to the Papistry, for both the one and the other is more ancient than is the Papistical religion; yea, Mahomet had established his Alcoran before any Pope of Rome was crowned with a triple crown," &c. Can any man think John Knox was so very unlearned as to imagine that Episcopacy was not much older than Mahomet? Or knowing it to be *older*, that yet he could have been so ridiculous as to have thought it a *relict* of Popery, which *he* himself affirmed to be *younger* than Mahometism? Whoso pleases may see more of his sentiment about the novelty of Popery in his conference with Queen Mary recorded in his History.[1] One other testimony to this purpose I cannot forbear to transcribe. All that know any thing of the history of our Reformation must be presumed to know that *Superintendency* was erected by Mr Knox's special advice and counsel. That it was in its very height, anno 1566, is as indubitable. Now, we are told that Knox wrote the Fourth Book of his History that year. Hear him, therefore, in his Introduction to it[2]—"We can speak the truth whomsoever we offend. There is no realm that hath the Sacraments in like purity; for all others, how sincere that ever the doctrine be that by some is taught, retain in their Churches, and in the ministers thereof, some footsteps of Antichrist and dregs of Popery. But we, all praise to God alone, have nothing within our churches that ever flowed from that Man of Sin." Let any man judge now if Mr Knox looked upon *imparity* as a *dreg* of Popery.

Thus we have found Knox, when he had the fairest occasions, the strongest temptations, the most awakening calls, when it was most seasonable for him to have declared for the *Divine right* of *parity* and the *unlawfulness* of Prelacy, still silent in the matter; or rather, on all occasions, proceeding on suppositions, and reasoning from principles, fairly allowing the lawfulness of Prelacy. But is there no more to be said? Yes, more with a witness.

In his "Exhortation to England for the speedy embracing of Christ's Gospel," dated from Geneva, January 12, anno 1559, amongst many other *Reformations*, he is for *reforming* their Bishoprics indeed; but how? By *abolishing*

[1] Knox, 318. [2] Knox, 308; Calderwood, 40.

them? Nothing like it. How then? Take it in his own words[1]—"Let no man be charged in preaching of Christ Jesus above that a man may do; I mean, that your Bishoprics be so divided, that of every one, as they are now for the most part, may be made ten; and so in every city and great town there may be placed a godly learned man, with so many joined with him, for preaching and instruction, as shall be thought sufficient for the bounds committed to their charge." So he; and let our *parity-men*, if they can, give this testimony a gloss favourable to their side of the question, without destroying the text. The truth is, this testimony is so very *nicking*, that I am apt to apprehend it might have been for its sake that this whole tractate was left out of the folio edition of Knox's Works, printed at London, anno 1641.[2] However, the *Inquisition*, it seems, has not been so *strict* at Edinburgh, for there it escaped the *index expurgatorius*; and yet though it had not, the *good cause* had not been one whit the securer, for Knox's practice would have sufficiently determined the matter; for did not *he* compile the "First Book of Discipline?[3] and is not *imparity* fairly established there? Did not he *write* and *bear* the letter sent by the "Superintendents, Ministers, and Commissioners of the Church within the Realm of Scotland, to their Brethren the Bishops and Pastors in England," anno 1566?[4] Did not he, in that *same title* of that *same letter*, acknowledge that these "Brethren, Bishops, and Pastors of England, had renounced the Roman Antichrist, and professed the Lord Jesus in sincerity?" And doth not the letter all along *allow* of the Episcopal power and authority of these English Bishops? Did not he publicly and solemnly admit Mr John Spottiswoode to the Superintendency of Lothian, anno 1561?[5] Did not he concur at the Coronation of King James the Sixth with a Bishop,[6] and two Superintendents, anno 1567?[7] Was not he some time a Commissioner for Visitation, as they were then called, i.e. a temporary Bishop?

[1] Page, 110. [2] See note 3, Pref. p. 13. [3] Spottiswoode, 174.
[4] Spottiswoode, 198; Petrie, 348; Calderwood, 41; Knox, 445.
[5] Knox, 289; Old Liturgy.
[6] The notorious Adam Bothwell, Bishop of Orkney, who *anointed* the infant monarch, and placed the crown upon his head.—E.]
[7] Spottiswoode, 211.

And did not he then act in a *degree* of *superiority* above the rest of his brethren within the bounds of his commission? Did not he sit, and vote, and concur in many General Assemblies, where Acts were made for performing canonical obedience to Superintendents! In fine, doth not Spottiswoode tell us[1] that "he was far from the dotages wherein some that would have been thought his followers did afterwards fall"—"that never man was more obedient to Church authority than he"—"that he was always urging the obedience of ministers to their Superintendents, for which he caused diverse Acts to be made in the Assemblies of the Church"—and that "he shewed himself severe to the transgressors?"

I have insisted the longer on this instance of Knox, because he made a *singular figure* amongst our Reformers. Besides, having so fully evinced that he, whom our brethren value so much, was no *Divine-right-of-parity-man*, I think it may readily pass for credible that neither were any of the rest of our Reformers of that opinion. And now, to bring home all this to my main purpose, if not so much as one of our Reformers, no, not Knox himself, was for the *Divine right* of *parity*, I think it may amount to an undeniable evidence, at least to a strong presumption, that they were not of the present Presbyterian principles; and all this will appear still farther unquestionable when it is considered, in the fourth place, how much reason there is to believe that our Reformers proceeded generally on the same principles with the Reformers of England, where the government of the Church, by *imparity*, was continued without the least opposition.

This is a consideration which, I am afraid, may not relish well with the *inclinations* of my Presbyterian brethren, yet, withal, may be of considerable weight with unprejudiced people, and bring light to several things about our Reformation, which even those who have read our histories and monuments may have past over inadvertently; and therefore I shall take leave to insist upon it somewhat fully, and I shall proceed by these steps.

1. I shall endeavour to represent how our Reformation,

[1] Spottiswoode, 266.

under God, was principally cherished and encouraged by *English influences*. 2. I shall endeavour to represent how, in correspondence to these *influences*, our Reformers were generally of the same mind with the Church of England, in several momentous instances relating to Constitution and Communion, the government and polity of the Church, wherein our present Presbyterian principles stand in direct opposition and contradiction to her. If I can make these two things appear, I think I shall make a considerable advance towards the determination of the Second Inquiry.

1. I say, our Reformation, under God, was cherished and encouraged principally by *English influences*. That Scotland, barring foreign influences, is naturally disposed for receiving *English* impressions, cannot but be obvious to common sense. We not only live in the same island separated from all other neighbourhood—we not only breath the same air, and speak the same language, and observe the same customs, and have all the opportunities of reciprocating all the offices which can result from daily commerces, and familiar acquaintances, and easy correspondences, and matrimonial conjunctions, and innumerable other such endearing relations, and allectives to mutual kindness; but also Scotland is the lesser, England the larger—Scotland the more barren, England the more fertile—Scotland the poorer, England the richer—Scotland the more penurious of people, England the more populous—Scotland every way the weaker, England every way the stronger kingdom; and, by consequence, Scotland every way the more apt to receive, and England every way the more apt to give impressions. And nature in this is fully justified by experience; for what Scottish man knows not, that when the late Revolution was a carrying on, as England cast the copy to Scotland, so it was used and pressed, as one of the most popular and influential topics to persuade the Scots to follow the copy, that England had done it; and why should Scotland follow a separate course? Was not England a powerful and a wise nation? What defence could Scotland make for itself if England should invade it? And how was it to be imagined that England would not invade Scotland, if Scotland did not follow England's measures? So that, to stand by K[ing] J[ames], when England had rejected him, what was it else

than to expose the nation to unavoidable ruin? Who knows not, I say, that this was one of the most pressed, because one of the most plausible arguments in the beginning of the late Revolution? And who sees not that the force of the argument lay in Scotland's obnoxiousness to England's impressions? Let no true-hearted Scottish man imagine it is in my thought to dishonour my native country. I have said no more than all the world knows to be true, and what cannot be denied. If we could contend with them for virtue and integrity, for honour and gallantry, for civility and loyalty, for *glories* that are truly *manly*, it were for the credit of our nation, and it were our own fault if we were inferior to them in such competitions. But it is *arrant vanity* to contend with them for *wealth*, or *strength*, or *multitude*. Now, to bring this home to my purpose. God had so ordered, in his wise providence, that, for many ages before, Scotland had not been so free of foreign influence as a little before and all the time our Church was a reforming. The French were the only foreign influences which were wont to find entertainment in Scotland; and in those times the French had treated us very basely[1] and

[1] [It is not quite clear that Bishop Sage is correct in the inferences which he draws from the ill treatment by the French in the beginning of his argument, viz. that it turned away the affections of the Scots from France, and led them to look to England. Their national jealousy of the latter kingdom, and their desire to be revenged for the fatal disaster of Flodden, far outweighed their sense of the continued coldness and neglect of France. Indeed, it was the fear lest the Queen, to whom the tutelage of their youthful Sovereign had been entrusted by the will of his deceased father, might be influenced in the execution of her important task by her brother, Henry VIII., that induced the Scottish Nobles to petition the Court of France for the presence of Albany, who, on his first arrival in Scotland, found that he was supported by a faction, embracing almost the whole Nobility, and by the sympathies of the great mass of the people. But though our author is wrong in the cause which he assigns for the influence of England at this period, the *fact* itself soon became quite true. The tempting bribes of Henry could not be withstood by the needy Barons of Scotland, and their patriotism melted away at the contact of English gold. It is notorious that they *sold* themselves to extend the influence of the English monarch throughout their native land, and some of them were so lost to all sense of national honour, that they secretly joined in a treasonable plan for delivering their Sovereign into the hands of his ambitious uncle. An idea may be formed of the shameful venality of the Nobles, and of the indefensible system of meddling and espionage instituted by Henry, which paralyzed every measure of Albany, from the following quotations. Lord Dacre, Henry's agent, in a letter to Wolsey, says —" I

dishonourably. I shall deduce the matter with all convenient brevity.

King Henry the Eighth of England had resolved upon a war with France, anno 1512. The French King perceiving this, applied to James the Fourth of Scotland, his old confederate, to engage him in an alliance against Henry. His application was successful, a private league was made betwixt them in November that year.[1] Two of the Articles were, that "if England should invade Scotland, France should wage war with all its might against England; Scotland should do the like if England invaded France; and neither of the two should take truce with England without the other gave his consent, and were comprehended therein, if he pleased." In pursuance of this League, James raised a potent army, invaded England, incurred the Pope's displeasure to the very sentence of excommunication,[2] fought the fatal battle of Flowden, September 9, 1513,[3] lost his life and the flower of all the Scottish Nobility and gentry, and left behind him James the Fifth, an infant, exposed, with his whole State, to the not very tender mercies of King Henry. Here was serving the French interests with a witness. Well, how did Lewis requite this? The next year he patched up a Peace with Henry, without

labor and study all I can to make division and debate to the intent that, if the Duke will not apply himself, their debate may grow that it shall be impossible for him to do justice; and also I have secret messages from the *Earl of Angus and others*, and also 400 outlaws, and giveth them rewards that burneth and destroyeth in Scotland." Wolsey, again, writing to his royal master about some instructions which he had transmitted to Dacre as to renewed efforts at corruption, adds—"And though some *money* be employed for the entertainment of the said *Homes* and rebels, it will quit the cost at length." And after the death of James, in a letter from the Duke of Suffolk to the traitors themselves, the exact sums are specified which some of them had received as the rewards of their perfidious conduct. "To the Earls of Angus, L.200; Glencairn, 200 merks; Cassillis, 200 merks; the Master of Maxwell, L.100; Sheriff of Air, L.100; Laird of Drumlanrig, L.100; Earl Marischall, 300 merks; Sir George Douglas, L.200." Bribery, therefore, was the real cause of the estrangement of Scotland from France, and not the "treatment" which she had received from her old ally. It is easy to see how our author was misled, for with the light which he enjoyed, it could scarcely have been otherwise, but modern research, by discovering additional information, has expiscated the truth. Vide Tytler's History of Scotland, vol. v. pp. 73-82, 98-9, 395. E.]

[1] Leslie, 343; Herbert, 27. [2] Herbert 29. [3] Leslie, 349; Herbert, 44.

comprehending Scotland, without respect to his faith and promise, without pity to those who were reduced to such extremities on his account. If this was not, what can be called *disobliging*?[1] But this was not all. The Scots, reduced to these difficulties, and sensible that it was not possible for the nation to subsist under an infant King without a Regent, became humble supplicants to the French King that he would send them John Duke of Albany, then in the French service, a man of great abilities, and next by blood[2] to the Scottish Crown, that he might be their Governor during their King's minority. But Henry's threats for a long time prevailed more with the French King[3] than Scotland's necessities, or his obligations to it, for Albany came not to Scotland till May 1515,[4] so that for near two years, through the French coldness and indifferency towards Scottish affairs, the kingdom had no settled Government. The war broke out again betwixt France and England anno . . . , and a new Peace was concluded anno 1518, and Albany, our Scottish Regent, was present in person when it was concluded. But the English obstinacy, not to comprehend Scotland, was more effectual with Francis the First, who had then got upon the throne, than all the intercessions of Albany, or the merits of our nation.[5] Nay, if we may believe Herbert, it was one of the main articles of that Treaty, that Albany should not return to Scotland,[6] nor did he return till October 1521;[7] and returning then, Henry reckoned it a main breach of Treaty, nay, and plain perjury in Francis that he gave way to it.[8] Thus were we treated then by France.

Let us now consider if Henry was at any pains all this while to make an interest in Scotland. And if we may believe the unanimous voice of our own historians, or my Lord Herbert in the History of his Life,[9] never was man

[1] Pax pacta est, quæ res non tantam tranquillitatem regno Galliæ peperit, quantam regi notam inussit, quod, in illa percutienda, Scotorum, qui illius causa, Anglis, Bellum intulerunt, nulla omnino facta fuerit mentio. Leslie, 355.

[2] [He was the son of Alexander, Duke of Albany, brother of James III.—E.]

[3] Herbert, 50. [4] Buchanan, 488. [5] Leslie, 372.

[6] Herbert, 122. [7] Buchanan, 496. [8] Herbert, ibid.

[9] Herbert, 49, 59, 60, 65, 99, *passim*.

more earnest for any thing than he in that pursuit, and he had brave occasion for it; for not only were the Scots highly and justly irritated by the degenerous and undervaluing slights France had put upon them, as I have now made appear, but Henry had surprized them with an unexpected and unaccustomed generosity[1] after the battle of Flowden. He had not pursued his victory, but had listened gently to their addresses for peace, and told them, that though he might, yet he would not take advantage of their circumstances; he would treat them frankly; if they were for peace, so was he; if for war, they should have it:[2]—a response so full of true honour and gallantry as could not but work on their affections. Besides, his sister Margaret, the Queen of Scots, a lady of rare endowments, was all alongst working to his hand, and making a party for him. James the Fourth, by his testament, before he went to Flowden, had nominated her Governess of the Realm during her widowhood. This gave her once the principal hand in affairs. It is true she was young and lively, and married within a year after the King's death, and so lost her title to the Regency. But then she married the Earl of Angus, the choice of all the Scottish Nobility, and one who was in great repute with all ranks of people;[3] so that however her marriage annulled her title, it did not so much weaken her interest, but that she had still a great party in the nation—so great, that though Albany was advanced to the Regency, she was for the most part able to overbalance him in point of *power* and *following*.

In short, such was Henry's and his sister's influence, that all the time Albany was Regent the nation was divided into two factions—the one French, headed by Albany, the

[1] [Whatever were the professions of the English monarch on this occasion, they were hollow and false. It was *against his will and special orders* that the victory of Flodden was not followed up, and advantage taken of the crippled and disordered state of the country; and Surrey, his able general, would not have thwarted his master except from necessity. In fact, the loss which the English army sustained in that fatal field was so severe as to render it imprudent, and the want of a co-operating fleet made it impossible, to invade Scotland immediately after the battle. Tytler, vol. v. p. 73.—E.]

[2] Henricus, animo magno et vere regio, respondit, sibi cum Scotis pactis, pacem, cum bellantibus, bellum fore. Buchanan, 485.

[3] Buchanan, 484, 489.

other English, headed by the Queen-Dowager, and hers was generally the more prevalent; so much, that though Albany was perhaps one of the bravest gentlemen that ever was honoured with the Scottish Regency, he was never able to prosecute to purpose any project he undertook for the French service. Thus, anno 1522, he raised an army to invade England, but with what success? Why, the Scottish Nobility waited upon him to the Border indeed, but they would go no further. They told him plainly they would hazard lives and fortunes in defence of their country, but it was another thing to invade England.[1] And Lesly plainly attributes all this refractoriness in these Nobles to the Queen's influence; nay, it is evident from the same Lesly, that the baseness and ingratitude of the French in the forementioned Treaties was one of the principal arguments that moved them to such backwardness;[2] and Albany was sensible of it, and therefore went to France, and told the French King so much, and asked a swinging army of Frenchmen, five thousand horse and ten thousand foot. With such a force he promised to act something against England, but from the Scots by themselves nothing was to be expected.

And this his absence was a new opportunity to Henry to play his game in Scotland. Indeed, he neglected it not; he used all arts imaginable further to advance his own and weaken the French interest; he harassed the Borders without intermission, that in the miseries and desolations of war the Scots might see the beauties and felicities of peace on the one hand,[3] resolving as it were to *cudgel* them into an *accord*, if no other thing could do it; and, on the other hand, he had his emissaries and instruments busy at work in the heart of the kingdom, and about the helm of affairs, employing all their skill and interest, all their wit and rhetoric, all their eloquence and diligence, to persuade the nation to a perpetual amity with England, the Queen being the chief

[1] Buchanan, 487; Lesly, 386.

[2] Regina etsi absens, hujus tamen consilii nobilibus auctor fuit. Lesly, 386. Albanius cum intellexerat Scotos Nobiles a bello gerendo abhorrere, quod non reipublicæ suæ utilitate sed Regis Franci voluntate, tanquam susceptum illud putaverint, in Franciam transmittit, &c. Lesly, 387.

[3] Hostis autem consilium eo spectabat ut feroces Scotorum animos, malis fractos ad paciscendum secum cogeret. Buchanan, 499.

actrix.[1] Neither did this seem sufficient. He sent ambassadors, and wrote letters, and represented things in their fairest colours, and made most charming overtures, &c.[2] If they would break the league with France, and enter into one with England, the world should see, and they should find by experience, that it was not humour, or ambition, or love of greatness, that had moved him to treat them so, but love of concord, and concern for the prosperity and happiness of the nation—that he had but one only child, a daughter, Mary; her he would give to James in marriage; hereby the English would become subject to the Scottish, not the Scottish to the English Government; and a great deal more to this purpose. Whoso pleases may see this whole matter transcribed by Herbert[3] from Buchanan. I go on.

The French King was not at leisure, it seems, to afford Albany such assistances as he required, so he was obliged to return without them; and, returning, found the French interest still weaker and weaker, and the English stronger and stronger, as appears from his success. For having returned to Scotland in September 1523,[4] he instantly gave out his orders that the whole force of the kingdom should meet in Douglasdale against the middle of October. He found obedience so far, indeed, that they met; but when he had marched them to Tweed, and they found he designed to invade England, they would not move one foot further, but sounded aloud their old carol—"They knew by experience what was to be gained by invading England; it was enough for them that they were willing to defend their own country," &c.[5] Here they stood, I mean as to their *resolutions*, not their *ground;* for they left that, and instantly retired within their own Borders, so hastily, and with such strong inclinations, it seems, to be at home, that with great difficulty he got them to keep together some days, till he should fall on some pretext which might give a fair colour to his retreat, and cover it from appearing downright dishonourable. It is true, his luck was so good, that he found

[1] Nec segnius etiam Scoti, factionis Gallis adversæ laborabant ut perpetuum cum Anglo fœdus iniretur, Regina principe. Buchanan, 499.

[2] Si Scoti in animum inducerent, soluto cum Gallis fœdere, &c. Buchanan, ibid.

[3] Herbert, 148, 149. [4] Buchanan, 499. [5] Buchanan, 501.

it—but how? By the art and interest of the English faction.[1] Thus, Queen Margaret, to wait her opportunities, had come to the Border, and lodged not far from the Scottish camp. The Earl of Surrey commanded the English army, with whom she kept secret correspondence; and it was concerted betwixt them, it seems, that the English should by all means avoid fighting, and she should be employed as a mediatress; to bring matters to some honest accommodation. The plot succeeded, a truce was readily patched up, to the satisfaction, no doubt, of both parties. Albany had reason to be glad of it, for he could make no better of the bargain, and it was with much difficulty he brought his expedition to so honourable an issue; and it is plain the English faction had reason to be as glad, for they had gained two points—they had got Albany to understand the temper of the nation, and the weakness of the French interest; and they had treated the Scots, who were so averse from fighting, so discreetly, by shunning all occasions of engaging, and thereby shewing that they were no enemies to the Scots, unless it was on the French account, that they could not have fallen on a more successful politic for gaining King Henry's great purpose, which was to disengage the Scots of the French as much as he could; and the success was agreeable. For after that, Albany's authority and the French interests decayed so sensibly, and the English faction managed their designs so successfully, that within a few months Albany was turned out of his Regency, and the young King, then but twelve years of age, was persuaded to take in his own hands the Government. It was the English faction, I say, that wrought this Revolution, as is evident from the whole thread of the history. And Lesly[2] tells us plainly that Albany was sensible of it, and was persuaded it was in vain to endeavour any more to gain them to the French side, and therefore he took his leave, and departed the country.[3] This was in the year 1524. The King so young, all know, was not able to manage the Government

[1] Lesly, 390, 391.

[2] Lesly, 393.

[3] Hinc intellexit Gubernator se apud quosdam Nobiles non esse gratiosum, qui Regis pueri imperitiam, suo excusso imperio, volebant subire, atque nullum bellum (quod, Franci causa, acriter urgebat Albanius) cum Anglis justum esse putabant. Lesly, 393.

by himself, but stood in need of counsellors. They were *English* who had got him thus *early* to assume the Government in his own person. It is obvious to collect, therefore, that they were *English enough* who were his counsellors, and such they were indeed. For, as Lesly has it,[1] a Parliament was indicted to meet in February thereafter, wherein a Council was nominated for assisting the King in the administration of the Government, but so as that the Queen was to have the sovereignty, so far as nothing was to be done without her special approbation and allowance.

Albany, the great opposer of his interests in Scotland thus despatched, King Henry's whole soul was divided betwixt gladness and kindness. He was glad, almost to excess, that he had got rid of such an eye-sore[2]—he was kind to the highest degree to his sister, and nephew, and the Scottish Nobility. He despatched two Ambassadors with all expedition for Scotland, by whom he offered to establish a lasting peace, and, in the interim, agreed to a truce for a year, till a *fond* for a solid settlement might be maturely considered.[3] On the other hand, our Queen, without doubt with her brother's foreknowledge and allowance, having now the reins in her hands, sends three Ambassadors to England—the Earl of Cassillis, the Bishop of Dunkeld,[4] and the Abbot of Cambuskenneth,[5] to propose to Henry, in the name of the Scottish nation, that there might be a firm and perpetual amity established betwixt the two Crowns; and to this great end that a match might be agreed to betwixt James and Mary. Henry entertained the proposition with all imaginable shews of satisfaction, but demanded two things—"That the Scots might break the league with France and make one of that same nature with England;" and "that James might be educated in England till ripe for marriage." But the Scottish Ambassadors were not *plenipotentiaries* enough for adjusting these matters. Cassillis, therefore, comes home; a new meeting of the States is

[1] Ita tamen ne quid horum consilio omnino statueret vel antiquaret Rex, quod Regina tanquam Regni Princeps, antea, sua authoritate non fixerit aut refixerit. Lesly, 397.

[2] Incredibili quadam lætitia elatus. Lesly, 394. [3] Lesly, ibid.

[4] [Robert Cockburn, successor to the celebrated Gavin Douglas.—E.]

[5] [Alexander Milne.—E.]

called, and Cassillis is returned to England with commission to tell Henry—"That the Scottish Lords are content to relinquish the French on condition the match with the Princess Mary were secured."[1] It is true, nothing followed upon this treaty but a truce for three years, for what reason I know not: but from the deduction I have briefly made, it may sufficiently appear how weak the French and how strong the English interest was then in Scotland—so very strong, as clearly to overcome and almost quite extirpate the other. Well! Did Francis nothing to recover the Scottish amity? Alas! at that time, he had greater matters to employ his thoughts. He lost his liberty at the battle of Pavia, anno 1525, and became the King of Spain's prisoner, and was not restored to his freedom till Henry interposed with a powerful mediation; for which he entered into another league with Henry, 1527, without minding the Scots, or being concerned for their security. This was a third slight put upon the Scots by the French in their treaties with England.[2] It is true, indeed, Francis did not enter into this league with Henry overawed by his threats, but constrained by his kindness and good offices in his liberation from his Spanish captivity. But it was all one to the Scots for what reason it was, if they were deserted.

It is true, indeed, when James came to full age he had strong inclinations for renewing the old amity with France; and no wonder, considering how much he was managed by the clergy, who abhorred Henry for shaking off the Pope's authority, and thought themselves concerned, with all their might, to guard against Henry's contagious influences, as they deemed them. But, however the King and clergy were inclined, it is evident the body of the nation continued constant in their so frequently provoked coldness to the French interests, and in their good affection towards England—so much, that they would never thereafter, at least all the time our Reformation was a carrying on, follow either King or Regent to invade England. Thus, when James the Fifth, anno 1542, was very earnest for it, the Nobility generally

[1] See for all this, Lesly, 394, 395; Herbert, 163.

[2] Gallus studio, maxime et diligentia Angli, in libertatem, ex Hispanorum manibus restitutus, fœdus adeo amplum cum iis fecit ut multum Scotico fœderi derogaretur. Buchanan, 519.

declined it, and he was forced to dismiss them.[1] And when shortly after that, his earnestness that way, it seems, encreasing, he ordered an army to meet at Carlaverock, intending therewith to enter England, so soon as Oliver Sinclair was declared chief commander, and the King's intentions were made known, all threw away their arms, and suffered themselves to be taken prisoners.[2] And when the Earl of Arran, Regent, anno, . . ., went with a goodly army to besiege the church of Coldingham, which the English for the time had fortified, he was forced to run for it abruptly, fearing, as Buchanan says,[3] his friends pretended, lest his army should betray him into the hands of the English. And anno 1557, when the Queen-Regent, Mary of Lorraine, was most earnest to have had England invaded, thereby to have made a diversion, and eased France of the English force which was assisting Philip the Second of Spain against Henry the Second of France, the Nobility could by no means be gained to do it, as all our historians tell us. I could have insisted on this deduction far more largely, but I think what I have said may be sufficient for my purpose, which was to shew how much Scotland was disengaged of *foreign influences*, and by consequence how much it was disposed to receive *English impressions*, from the very dawning of our Reformation till its legal establishment 1560.

Let us next try, if according to these *dispositions*, the *English influences* were communicated, and made suitable impressions.

And I think, in the first place, no man can reasonably doubt but that it is fairly credible they did; for no man can deny that the Reformation made a considerable figure in England more early than it did in Scotland. When *light* was thus *arising* in the isle, it was natural for it to overspread both nations; and it was as natural that the more and sooner enlightened nation should be the fountain of communication—that is, in plain terms, that Scotland should derive it, under God, from England; especially considering how at that time they were mutually disposed towards one another.

[1] Rex mirum in modum cupiebat prælio decernere, adversa nobilitate; a quibus id impetrare non poterat. Buchanan, 528; Lesly, 435.

[2] Lesly, 437; Buchanan, 529. [3] Buchanan, 544.

Indeed, second, it is certain, *books* deserve to be reckoned amongst the *prime vehicles* of such *light* as we are now considering, and it is as certain, that the first books which enlightened Scotland were brought from England.[1] Tindal translated the New Testament into English, anno 1531, and copies of it were dispersed here in considerable plenty; and other useful books were then written also in the vulgar language, which was common to both nations; which coming from England had great success in Scotland, as is evident even from Knox's History.[2]

But this is not all. The truth of all this will appear more fully, if, third, we consider that King Henry had no sooner begun his Reformation, such as it was, in England, than he endeavoured to transmit it into Scotland. He shook off the Pope's supremacy anno 1534, and he sent the Bishop of St David's[3] to his nephew, James of Scotland, anno 1535,[4] with books written in English, containing the substance of Christian religion, earnestly desiring him to read them, and join with him in carrying on the Reformation. And Herbert[5] says, Henry was vastly solicitous "to draw James on his side, as knowing of what consequence it was to keep his kingdom safe on that part, and therefore laboured still to induce him to abrogate the Papal jurisdiction in his dominions." And though this embassy of St David's had not success, yet Henry gave not over, but continued to write letters to James, insisting still upon the same requests. Petrie has transcribed one from Fox,[6] wherein Henry "premonishes, requires, and most heartily prays James to consider the

[1] [It is certain that the principles of the Reformation had become spread in Scotland before the year 1531 by the writings of Luther, for we find in the Acts of the Scottish Parliaments, that so early as 1525 stringent enactments were made prohibiting foreign merchants from importing heretical books, under the penalty of forfeiting the ships which brought them into the country. This, however, only confirms our author's general argument, and accounts in some measure for the Lutheran aspect of early Scottish Protestantism. Vide Tytler, vol. v. p. 163.—E.]

[2] Knox, 38.

[3] [Dr. W. Barlow, famous as having been one of the consecrators of Matthew Parker, Archbishop of Canterbury, December 17, 1559. The other consecrators were Scory, Bishop of Hereford; Coverdale, Bishop of Exeter, and Hodgkins, Suffragan of Bedford.—E.]

[4] Buchanan, 520; Spottiswoode, 70. [5] Herbert, 396. [6] Petrie, 176.

supremacy granted by the Holy Scriptures to Princes in Church matters: to weigh what God's Word calleth a Church; to consider what superstitions, idolatries, and blind abuses have crept into all Realms, to the high displeasure of God; and what is to be understood by the censures of the Church, and excommunication (for the Pope had then excommunicated Henry); and how no such censure can be in the power of the Bishop of Rome, or of any other man, against him or any other Prince having so just ground; to avoid from the root and to abolish such an execrable authority as the Bishop of Rome hath usurped, and usurps upon all Princes, to their great damage; requesting him, for these reasons, to ponder of what hazard it might be to James himself if he agreed to such censures, and by such example gave upper hand over himself and other Princes to that Usurper of Rome, to scourge all who will not kiss and adore the foot of that *corrupt holiness*, which desires nothing but pride and the universal thrall of Christendom," &c. Here was earnestness for reformation in Scotland with a witness! And can it be imagined that Henry, who was so serious with the King of Scots, was at no pains at all with his subjects, with the Nobility and gentry, with such as might have influence either at the Court or in the country?

No, certainly, as may be evident, if we consider, fourth, that when, in the year 1540, or 1541, Henry was earnest for a congress with James, to try, no doubt, if meeting face to face, and personal and familiar converse and conference, might prevail with him. All our *Scottish Protestants* were mighty zealous that the interview might take effect, and both time and place, which was York, might be punctually observed.[1] Is not this a demonstration that they understood Henry's project, and approved his designs, and that they were in the same bottom with him in pursuance of a reformation? It is true, James followed other counsels, and disappointed the interview, and therefore Henry turned angry, and raised war against him; but, then, it is as true, that James found his subjects so backward, as I shewed,

[1] Factio sacerdotibus iniquior toto conatu, atque animi viribus, eo incubuerunt, ut Rex tempus locumque colloquii petitum obiret. Buchanan, 525.

and was so unsuccessful in the management of that war, that he contracted melancholy, and soon after died.

Add to this, fifth, that after James's death Henry persisted in his concern to advance the Reformation in Scotland as well as in England. To this end he was careful that those of the Scottish Nobility and gentry who were taken prisoners at Solway Moss might be lodged with such persons as could instruct them in the Reforming principles; and so soon as he heard that James was dead, and had left a daughter some few days old, yet heiress to the Crown, he despatched them for Scotland to promote his interests in the matter of the match he was zealous to have made betwixt his son, Prince Edward, and our infant Sovereign. Indeed, they were as diligent as he could have desired. They got it carried in Parliament; and that they did it from a prospect of carrying on the reformation[1] of religion by that conjunction cannot be doubted, if we may believe Dr Burnet, in his "Abridgement of the History of the Reformation of the Church of England;" for there[2] he not only tells—"That Cassillis had got these seeds of knowledge at Lambeth under Cranmer's influences, which produced afterwards a great harvest in Scotland;" but also "that the other prisoners were instructed to such a degree, that they came to

[1] [If it be true that religious motives entered at all into the heads of the Scottish Nobles in this matter, we, who are acquainted with the *other secret* causes of their devotion to Henry, cannot bestow upon them a very high meed of praise for their zeal. It is well known that their own liberty, which was to be the reward of the success of their treasonable plans, and large bribes from the English monarch, had more to do with the conduct of those Nobles, than love for the cause of reformed religion. And what are we to think of the honesty and principle of men, who, as Henry said, "had not sticked to set the crown of Scotland upon his head," nevertheless at the same time hypocritically binding themselves by an opposite engagement "to remain, true, faithful, and obedient servants to their own Sovereign, to assist the Lord Governor (Arran) for defence of the realm against their old enemies of England;" and, what is worse, if their reforming convictions were sincere, "to support the liberties of Holy Church, and to maintain the true Christian Faith," i. e. the existing Church and doctrine? Such duplicity, upon the supposition that these captive Lords were real supporters of the Reformed cause at this time, only shews that they had deeply imbibed and boldly acted upon the poisonous maxim—"*The end justifies the means.*" Vide Tytler, vol. v. p. 296-392.—E.]

[2] Burnet, 279, 280.

have very different thoughts of the changes that had been made in England from what the Scottish clergy had possessed them with, who had encouraged their King to engage in the war by the assurance of victory, since he fought against a heretical Prince," &c. And a little after they were sent home, and went away much pleased, both with the splendour of the King's Court, and with the way of religion which they had seen in England. And that we have reason to believe this author in this matter is evident, because he is justified herein by all our historians, especially Buchanan, as may appear by the sequel. Here was success of the *English influences*—seven of the *supreme order*, i. e. Noblemen, and twenty-four of inferior quality, considerable gentlemen, all *enlightened* in England, for so Buchanan numbers them.[1]

And here, by the way, it will not be amiss to consider the strength of the Protestant party in Scotland when in this Parliament, wherein the match, by the influence of the English converts, was agreed to. They were so strong that they carried the Regency for the Earl of Arran, prompted thereto chiefly by the persuasion they had of his affection to the Reformation, as is evident from the consentient accounts of Buchanan, Knox, and Spottiswoode.[2] They carried it for the match with England in opposition to all the Popish party, as I have just now represented. Nay, which is more, because more immediately concerning the reformation of Religion, they procured an Act to be made "That it should be lawful to every man to take the benefit of the translation which they then had of the Bible,[3] and other treatises containing

[1] Buchanan, 532. [2] Buchanan, 531; Knox, 36; Spottiswoode, 71.

[3] [It is most likely that this was Tindal's translation made in 1531, but whether any copy had been printed in Scotland at this time is doubtful; for the first authentic accounts which we have of a regular edition of the Holy Scriptures being published and circulated throughout the parishes of Scotland are derived from the Acts of a General Assembly held nearly thirty years subsequent to this, when "a statement was laid before them by Alexander Arbuthnot, burgess of Edinburgh, and Thomas Bassanden, printer and burgess, respecting the publication of an edition of the Bible in English." Correctors were appointed to oversee the work, the price was to be L.4. 13s. 4d. Scottish money, and the time arranged at which it should be published. If this was the first copy of the Scriptures *printed and published in Scotland*, the only way of accounting for the delay which ensued, after the

wholesome doctrine, &c.[1] Indeed, at that time the Reformation was so far advanced that the Regent kept his two Protestant chaplains, Williams and Rough, both Church-of-England men, as we shall hear, who preached publicly to the Court,[2] and declaimed boldly against the *Roman corruptions*—so far advanced, that it stood fair within a short space to have got the public establishment, if Arran the Regent, to keep the Pope's cover on his title to the succession, wherein without it there were a *couple* of sad *chasms*,[3] and for other worldly ends, had not played the *jade*, by renouncing his profession and returning to the Pope's obedience.

permission by the Parliament in 1542-3, is that the power and influence of the clergy, who were opposed to the dissemination of the Scriptures in the vulgar tongue, were still very great, and sufficient to withhold the accomplishment of a project deservedly of the first magnitude in the opinion of the Reformers. It is worthy of remark, in reference to this Act of Parliament, procuring the free use of the translation of the Bible, that it was introduced by Lord Maxwell, who had become a convert to the Reformed doctrines during his imprisonment in England. This confirms our author's argument as to *English influences*, and proves that amid the inconsistency and sordid conduct of the Scottish Nobles, there was one who had some regard to the spread of religious truth. This act of Lord Maxwell, as it is a proof of *his* sincerity, only sets the conduct of his son, the Master of Maxwell, who was a hired pensioner of Henry (vide note *supra*, p. 126), in a more unfavourable light.—E.]

[1] Knox, 38 ; Spottiswoode, 72.

[2] Lesly, 443 ; Knox, 36 ; Spottiswoode, 72.

[3] [These "chasms" originated in the marriages both of his father and grandfather. His grandfather, Lord Hamilton, married Mary, daughter of James II., who had divorced her former husband, Lord Boyd, after his disgrace and attainder. The father of the Regent was the offspring of this marriage. He was created first Earl of Arran, and was thrice married. By his first wife he had no family. His second wife was Elizabeth, sister of Alexander, Earl of Home, and the *supposed* widow of Sir Thomas Hay, of the Family of Yester. From this lady he was divorced on an *allegation* that her first husband was still alive, and his Lordship having obtained the authority of the Bishop of Rome to re-marry, took to wife Janet, daughter of Sir David Beaton of Creich in Fife, and widow of Sir Thomas Livingston of Easter Wemyss, by whom he had James, second Earl of Arran and Duke of Chatelherault, Regent, and declared by Parliament next heir to the throne to Queen Mary in her non-age. It is a curious fact that Cardinal Beaton, with whom he was nearly connected, objected to his legitimacy, and as the reward of not pressing his objection always possessed the greatest influence over Arran. Hence it is easy to perceive the interest which he had in adhering to the Church of Rome, and keeping the "*Pope's cover*" on the defects of his genealogical tree, caused by the irregular marriages of his grandfather and father. See

Observe, further, by the way, that this first Parliament of Queen Mary's was holden in her name, and by her authority, upon the 13th of March 1542-3, as is clear not only from our historians, but the printed Acts of Parliament, and she was not crowned till the 20th of August thereafter, if we may believe both Lesly and Buchanan.[1] And yet there was not so much as the least objection made then against the legality of the Parliament. No such thing was thought on; so that it is no new nor illegal thing for Scottish monarchs to hold Parliaments before their coronations.[2] But this, as I said, by the way.

Such was the strength of the Reforming party then, and this strength, under God, advanced so far principally by *English influences*. And all this will appear more convincing still, when it is considered, in the sixth place, that all alongst the Popish clergy were very sensible of it, and very much offended with it, and were at all imaginable pains to disappoint it and oppose it. Thus, when Henry sent the Bishop of St David's, as we have heard, anno 1535, to treat with James about Reforming, the clergy were in a dreadful *pother* how to keep off the interview, and used all imaginable arguments with the King to dissuade him from listening to it, telling him it would ruin religion, and that would ruin his soul, his state, his kingdom, &c.[3] Nay, the Pope himself was extremely solicitous how to prevent so great a mischief, as he deemed it; for, as Lesly tells us,[4] his Holiness, finding that Henry had cast off his yoke, and fearing lest James should transcribe his uncle's copy, sent his Legates to Scotland to confirm him in the faith, and fortify him against

Noble's Historical Genealogy of the Family of the Stuarts, London, 1745, 4to. Anderson's Historical and Genealogical Memoirs of the House of Hamilton, Edinburgh, 1825, 4to. Knox's Hist. Edin. folio, p. 40-1.—E.]

[1] Leslie, 444, 445; Buchanan, 537.

[2] [It is difficult to say what caused this remark, but as to the fact of the Scottish Kings holding Parliaments before their coronations it is undoubted, and was practised by Charles I., William III., and Queen Anne. Former Kings were invariably crowned, but after the accession of James VI. to the throne of England, a change in the custom seems to have taken place, probably because there was an inconvenience from the residence of the Sovereign being for the most part in England.—E.]

[3] Sacerdotes qui pro aris et focis sibi certandum videbant fremere; religionem hoc congressu prodi. Buchanan, 521.

[4] Lesly, 415.

Henry's impressions; and Buchanan says,[1] he allowed him the tenths of all the benefices within the kingdom for three years' time to keep him right. Again, when Henry, anno 1540, insisted the second time for an interview, the clergy were in a whole sea of troubles; they used all arts, and tried all methods to impede it.[2] At last they fell upon the true *knack*, and a true demonstration of their concern, seeing it was a *knack* that looked so *unkindly* on their *pockets*, which was to promise him money largely, no less than 30,000 crowns yearly—says Buchanan—Knox calls them 50,000 out of their benefices, besides a vast sum which might arise out of the confiscated estates of heretics. Fifty thousand crowns was a good round sum in those days in Scotland. Further, how were they alarmed? what fears were they under? what shapes did they turn themselves in? what tricks did they play when the match betwixt Edward and Mary (spoken of before) was in agitation?[3] The Cardinal forged a will in the King's name, nominating himself the principal of four junct Regents for managing the Government during the Queen's minority, intending thereby to secure the Popish interests, and prevent the coming of the Nobility from England, who, he knew, would lay out themselves with all their might to oppose him, being his enemies upon the account of religion, and advance the designs of England. This not succeeding, for the forgery was manifest, his next care was that all the Popish party should *tumultuate*, bawl and clamour, confound and disturb the Parliament all they could; which, indeed, was done so successfully that nothing could be done to purpose till he was committed to custody.[4] Neither did this put an end to the practices of the party, but so soon as the Parliament, having concluded the match, was over, and he set at liberty, with the Queen Dowager's advice, who was all over French and Papist, he convenes

[1] Buchanan, 517.

[2] Id cum sacerdotes rescissent, actum de ordine suo rati, nisi congressum regum impedirent, &c. Buchanan, 525; vide Lesly, 431, 432.

[3] Occasio item supremæ potestatis invadendæ, et celeritatis egere visa est, ut captivorum et exulum, ex Anglia, reditum, præveniret, ne quid in approbatione sui honoris, eis, integrum relinqueret, quorum et potentiam et gratiam formidabat, et mentem a se alienam, ob diversum pietatis cultum non dubitabat. Buchanan, 531; vide Knox, 35; Spottiswoode, 71.

[4] Buchanan, 533.

the clergy, represents to them the impossibility of their standing the certain ruin of the Catholic religion, everything that could be frightful to them, unless that confederacy with England were broken ; obliges them, therefore, to tax themselves, and raise great sums of money for bribing some of the Nobility that were not proof against its charms and beauties ; and to use all their rhetoric with others to the same purpose ; and, lastly, it was concluded in that religious meeting that the match and alliance should be preached against from the pulpits, and that all possible pains should be taken to excite the populace to tumults and rabbles, and treat the English ambassador with all affronting tricks and rudenesses.[1] In short, the faction never gave over till they had cajoled the weak Regent into an abjuration of Protestancy, as was told before, and reconciled him to the French, which, then in Scotland, was all one with the Popish interest. Nay, his Holiness again interested himself in this juncture, as Lesly tells us,[2] sending Petrus Franciscus Contarenus, Patriarch of Venice, his Legate, into Scotland, to treat with the Regent and the Nobility in the Pope's name, and promise them large assistances against the English if they would break the contract of marriage betwixt Edward and Mary, which had so fatal an aspect towards the Catholic religion.[3] By this taste it is easy to discern how much the Popish party were persuaded of the great influence England had on Scotland in order to a reformation of Religion ; and, laying all together that hath been said, it is easy to perceive they wanted not reason for such a persuasion. Having thus given a brief deduction of the state of our Reformation in King Henry's time, and made it apparent that it was much encouraged and quickened by *English influences*, then, I think, I need not insist much on the succeeding reigns.

Briefly then, 7. As Edward the Sixth had the same reasons for interesting himself in our Scottish affairs which his father Henry had before him, so we find his counsels were suited accordingly. No sooner was Henry dead, and Somerset warmed in his protectoral chair, than the demands

[1] Vide Buchanan, 533, 534 ; Spottiswoode, 73. [2] Lesly, 445, 449.

[3] Studebat enim avertere illorum animos a nuptiis cum Anglo contrahendis, quod suspicaretur, per illam conjunctionem, aliquam fieri potuisse, in Scotia, religionis eversionem, &c. Lesly, 449.

about the match were renewed; and being rejected by the Popish party here, who had our weak Regent at their beck, and were then the governing party, the matter ended in a bloody war. Somerset raised a great army, and entered Scotland; but before it came to fighting, he sent a letter to the Scots,[1] written in such an obliging style, and containing so kind, and so fair, so equitable propositions, that the Regent, advised by some Papists about him, thought fit not to publish it to his army, but to give out that it tended to quite contrary purposes than it really contained—that it contained threats that the English were come to carry off the Queen by force, and ruin and enslave the nation, &c.—dreading, no doubt, that if he had dealt candidly, and shewed the letter to such men of interest in the nation as were there, it would have taken so with them that they would have laid aside thoughts of fighting. Indeed, this was no groundless jealousy; the matter was above board; for, as Buchanan tells us, in the next convention of Estates which was holden shortly after that fatal battle of Pinkie, those who were for the Reformation being of the *same religion* with England were zealous for the English alliance, and against sending the Queen into France;[2] and that they were the Papists only who were for sending her thither.

8. When Edward died, and his sister Mary ascended the throne, a heavy cloud, indeed, did hang over both nations, and threatened a dreadful storm to the reformation of Religion. Mary, according to her surly humour, fell to downright persecution in England; and our Queen-Dowager, having shouldered out Arran, and possessed herself of the Scottish Regency in her subtle way, was as zealous to maintain the superstitions of Popery, using *less cruelty*, indeed, than Mary, but *more policy*, and to the same purposes. And now the purgation of Christianity seemed to be brought to a lamentable stand in both kingdoms, and the hopes of those to be quite dashed who were breathing for the profession of that holy religion in its purity. "Yet God, in his kind

[1] Buchanan, 561; Spottiswoode, 88; Knox, 87.

[2] Erant qui ob religionis consensum Anglorum oblatam amicitiam censerent amplectendam——Galliæ factioni favebant omnes Papani. Buchanan, 566; Spottiswoode, 89.

providence, did otherwise dispose of things, and made that a means to advance religion amongst us which men thought should have utterly extinguished it: for some of those who fled from Mary's persecution in England, taking their refuge into this kingdom, did not only help to keep the light which had begun to shine, but made the sun to break up more clear than before," as Spottiswoode hath it from Knox.[1] For then came into Scotland William Harlaw, John Willock, John Knox, &c., of whom more hereafter. Thus we were still deriving more light and heat from England.

9. Mary died, and Elizabeth succeeded in November 1558. Our Queen was then in France; it was morally impossible to recover her thence. The *English influences*, which in Henry's and Edward's time had cherished our Reformation, except so far as God sent us Harlaw, Willock, and Knox, by his special providence, as I told you just now, were quite cut off all the time of Mary's Government. Our Reformers, therefore, to make the *best* of a *bad* hand, were earnest to be amongst the foremost courtiers with the Queen Regent: they were ready to serve her design with all possible frankness: particularly they were amongst the most forward for carrying on the match with the Dauphin of France, and voted cheerfully that he should have the matrimonial crown[2] conferred upon him after the solemnization of the marriage. In consequence of this their frankness, the Earl of Argyll and the Prior of St Andrews, two first-rate Protestants, were the persons nominated to pass into France to honour the Dauphin with that compliment, and they undertook it cordially. But in the very instant almost they were informed that Mary of England was dead, and Elizabeth on the Throne, and withal professing Protestancy. This altered their whole scheme. They presently considered the *English influences*, so long *stopped* in their courses, might now begin to *drop* again; and there were hopes of assistance from that female sovereign. So these two Lords, no doubt with the advice of the rest of the fraternity, gave over thoughts of their French voyage. The Dauphin might purchase a

[1] Spottiswoode, 92; Knox, 99.

[2] [By this all the rights and privileges of the husband of a Queen were conferred on the possessor of it.—E.]

crown for himself, or wait till his father died, if he could not do better; they resolved to carry him no *matrimonial crowns* from Scotland. Indeed, their hopes of assistance from England to carry on the reformation of religion were better grounded then than ever; for upon the death of Queen Mary of England, by French advice our Queen, as next heir to that Crown, had assumed the English titles. It is not to be thought Elizabeth liked this well, and, resolving to continue Queen of England, she had no reason. For who knows not that her *title* was *questionable?* But our Queen's *descent* was *uncontroverted.* What wonder, then, if Elizabeth thought herself concerned to secure herself as well as she could? And what more feasible and proper way for her security than to have the *affections*, and, by consequence, the *power* of Scotland on her side? And what measure so natural for obtaining *that* as to cherish the reformation of religion in Scotland, and weaken the Popish, and, by consequence, the French interests there, and get the rule of that kingdom put in the hands of Protestants? The politic was obviously solid; all the work was to set it a-going. But that difficulty was soon over; for no sooner did she employ some private instruments to try the Scottish pulses, than they *smelt* the matter, and *relished* it immediately. The least intimation that she was so inclined was to them as a spark of fire amongst gunpowder; it kindled them in a *thought.* They addressed her, quickly begged her protection, and plighted their faith that they would depend upon her, and stand by her, and to the utmost of their power secure her interests, if she would grant them suitable assistances. Thus the bargain was readily agreed to on both sides, and both performed their parts successfully. For who knows not that our Reformation was carried on by Elizabeth's auspices, by English arms, and counsels, and money in the year 1560? And who knows not that, by the Treaty at Leith in July that same year, after the French were expelled Scotland, when our Reformers, by her help, had got the upper hand, her crown was secured, as far as the Scottish Protestants could secure it? Who knows not, I say, that it was one of the Articles of that Treaty—"That the Queen of Scotland and King of France should not thereafter usurp the titles of England and Ireland, and should delete the

arms of England and Ireland out of their scutchions and whole household stuff?"[1] By this time, I think, it may competently appear how much our Scottish Reformation, under God, depended on *English influences*. But I have two things more to add.

10. Then it is considerable that some of our *chief luminaries*, of *those* who had a principal hand in preaching and planting the gospel in purity among us, had drunk in these principles in England, and brought them thence to Scotland with them. Thus the excellent martyr, Mr George Wishart, (of whom in part before), as Spottiswoode tells us,[2] had spent his time in Cambridge, and returned to his own country to promote the truth in it, anno 1544; and Mr John Spottiswoode, that worthy man who was so long Superintendent of Lothian after our Reformation, was one of Cranmer's disciples, as you may see in the beginning of the Life of Archbishop Spottiswoode his son, and also in his History.[3] And John Willock and William Harlaw had both lived in England before they preached in Scotland, as I have already accounted; and perhaps a strict inquiry might discover some others.[4]

11, and lastly, On the other hand, except so far as John Knox was Calvinist, and a lover of the Forms of Geneva, for which, perhaps, I shall account hereafter, none of our historians give so much as one particular instance of a Scottish Reformer who had his education in any other *foreign* Church, except Mr Patrick Hamilton, who, I think, cannot be proven to have been a *Presbyterian;* and though it could be done, it could amount to no more than the authority of a very young man, considering he was but twenty-three years of age when he died. Neither do they mention any *foreigner* who came here to Scotland to assist us in our Reformation. Lesly,[5] indeed, says, that the Scottish Protestants sent letters and messengers to Germany to call thence *Sacramentarian*

[1] Spottiswoode, 149. [2] Spottiswoode, 76. [3] Spottiswoode, 344.

[4] [We may add to this list David Lindsay, who is said to have been ordained in England, and who baptized Charles I. in the Palace of Dunfermline in 1600; and Christopher Goodman, a native of Chester, and Student of Brazennose College, Oxford. This person afterwards returned to England, and died Archdeacon of Richmond in 1603.—E.]

[5] Lesly, 492.

ministers, as being very dextrous at fostering sedition and subverting religion; but no other historian says so, and he himself says not that ever any such came to Scotland.

Thus, I think, I have accounted competently for the first thing proposed, viz.—That our Reformation, under God, was principally cherished and encouraged by *English influences*. I proceed to the second, which was, that in *correspondence* to these *influences*, our Reformers were generally of the same *mind* with the Church of England in several momentous instances relating to the constitution and communion, the government and polity, of the Church, wherein our present *Presbyterian* principles stand in direct opposition and contradiction to her.

That our Reformers agreed with those of the Church of England in the common Articles of the Christian faith in their Creed, was never called in question. But it is not my present purpose to consider the sentiments of our Reformers in relation to the Church as it is a *sect*, but as it is a *society*; neither shall I be curious to amuse[1] many particulars. I shall content myself with two or three of considerable weight and importance.

And, first, our Reformers generally, or rather unanimously, looked on the Church of England as a Church so well constituted, that her communion was a *lawful Communion*. For this we have two as good evidences as the nature of the thing is capable of, viz. the constant and uniform practice of our Reformers joining in the communion of the Church of England when they had occasion, as those of the Church of England did with the Church of Scotland; and their open *profession* in their *public deeds* that they thought it *lawful*.

1. I say, it was the constant practice of our Reformers to join in the communion of the Church of England when they had occasion, as those of the Church of England did with the Church of Scotland. Thus we find all such of our Reformers as in times of persecution fled into England still joining with the Church of England—*e. g.* Friar Alexander Seaton,[2] when he was forced to flee in King James the Fifth's time, went to England, and became the Duke of

[1] [Probably *amass*.—E.]

[2] Spottiswoode, 65.

Suffolk's chaplain, and died in that service. Alexander Aless was in great favour with King Henry, and called the King's Scholar.[1] He was a member of the English Convocation, and disputed against Stokesly, Bishop of London, and maintained there were but two Sacraments, Baptism and the Eucharist, anno 1536 or 1537;[2] and he it was that first turned the English Liturgy into Latin for Bucer's use, anno 1549, as both Heylin and Burnet in their Histories of the English Reformation tell us.[3] John Fife, and one Macdowdal, stayed as long in England as Aless did,[4] and it is not to be doubted that they were of the same principles. John M'Bee, during his abode in England, was liberally entertained by Nicholas Saxton, Bishop of Salisbury, who made much account of him,[5] which is no argument, I think, that he was a *Presbyterian*. Sir John Borthwick[6] was charged with heresy anno 1540, for maintaining "that the heresies, commonly called the *Heresies of England*, and their new Liturgy, were commendable, and to be embraced of all Christians;" and "that the Church of Scotland ought to be governed after the manner of the Church of England,"[7] i. e. under the King, and not the Pope, as supreme governor. Friar Thomas Guillam,[8] the first public preacher of the Reformed religion in Scotland—he by whose sermons John Knox got the first lively impressions of the truth[9]—this Guillam, I say, after Arran the Regent *apostatized*, withdrew and went into England,[10] and we hear no more of him; from which it is reasonable to conclude that he kept the common course with the other Reformers *there*.

John Rough[11] was the Regent's other chaplain while he was Protestant. He likewise fled to England, though

[1] Spottiswoode, 66.
[2] Burnet ad Ann.
[3] Burnet ad Ann; Heylin, p. 79.
[4] Spottiswoode, 66.
[5] Ibid.
[6] [Sir John Borthwick of Cenerie, Knight, was a son of William third Lord Borthwick, killed at Flodden in 1513. He died somewhere between the years 1565-70. The *charges* preferred against him, with the Answers published after his escape, are inserted by Fox in the second volume of his Acts and Monuments. —E.]
[7] Spottiswoode, 70; Petrie, 180.
[8] [See Bishop Keith's History of the Affairs of Church and State in Scotland, vol. i. note 2, p. 91, printed for the Spottiswoode Society. —E.]
[9] Life of Knox.
[10] Spottiswoode, 73.
[11] [See Keith's History, ibid.—E.]

sometime after Guillam. He preached some years in the towns of Carlisle, Berwick, and Newcastle, and was afterwards provided to a benefice by the Archbishop of York, where he lived till the death of King Edward. When Mary's persecution turned warm, he fled, and lived some time in Friesland. He came to London about some business, anno 1557, was apprehended, and brought before Bonner—questioned, if he had preached any since he came to England? Answered, he had preached none, but in some places where godly people were assembled he had read the "Prayers of the Communion Book set forth in the Reign of King Edward VI." Questioned again, what his judgment was of that Book? Answered, "he approved it, as agreeing in all points with the Word of God;" and so suffered martyrdom. I think this man was neither for parity, nor against Liturgies. But to proceed. The excellent Mr Wishart, as he had spent some time in England, as was told before, so it seems he returned to Scotland of *English*, I am confident not of *Presbyterian, principles;* for he was not only for the lawfulness of *Private Communion*, as appeared by his practice, but Knox[1] gives us fair intimations that he ministered it by a *set form*. I know King Edward's Liturgy was not then composed; but it is not to be imagined that the Reformers in England in Wishart's time administered the Sacrament without a *set form*. The *extemporary spirit* was not then in vogue. And why else could Sir John Borthwick have been charged with the *great heresy* of *commending* the English Liturgy? However I shall not be peremptory, because I have not the opportunity of inquiring at present what *Forms* the English Reformers had *then*. All I say is, if they had a Liturgy, it is very probable Wishart used it; for as Knox tells us, when he celebrated the Eucharist before his execution—"After he had blessed the bread and wine, he took the bread, and brake it, and gave to every one of it, bidding each of them *remember that Christ had died for them, and feed on it spiritually;* so taking the cup, he bade them *remember that Christ's blood was shed for them*," &c. So Knox, word for word—which account, I think, seems fairly to intimate that Wishart used a *form*, but if he did, what other could it be than *such* as he had learned in England?

[1] Knox's History, 69.

I have accounted already how John Willock and William Harlaw had served in the English Church before they came to Scotland.[1] I might perhaps make a fuller collection, but what needs more? Even Knox himself lived in communion with the Church of England all the time he was in that kingdom. He went not there to keep conventicles—to erect *altar* against *altar*—to *gather churches* out of the Church of England—to set up separate and schismatical churches, as some of our present parity men have sometimes done. No, He preached in the public churches, and in subordination to the Bishops; and he preached before King Edward himself, as he himself tells us, in his "Admonition to the Professors of the Truth in England,"[2] which it is very improbable he would have been allowed to have done if he had *condemned* the communion of the Church of England as it was *then* established; for who knows not, that in King Edward's time all schism and nonconformity were sufficiently discouraged? And through that whole "Admonition" he still speaks of himself as one of the ministers of the Church of England. Nay, if it be reasonable to collect men's sentiments from their reasonings, I am sure in that same "Admonition" I have enough for my purpose; for he reasons upon suppositions and from principles which clearly condemned separation from the Church of England as then established. For when he gives his thoughts of that fatal discord which happened between the two great men, Somerset and the Admiral,[3] as I take it, he discourses thus—"God compelled my tongue," says he, "openly to declare that the devil, and his ministers, the Papists, intended only the subversion of God's true religion, by that mortal hatred amongst those who ought to have been most assuredly knit together by Christian charity.—And especially that the wicked and envious Papists, by that ungodly breach of charity, diligently minded the overthrow of him (Somerset), that to his own destruction procured the death of his innocent friend and brother. All this trouble was devised by the devil and his instruments, to stop and lett Christ's disciples and their poor boat"[4]—i. e. the Church. What can be more plain, I say,

[1] Spottiswoode, 93. [2] P. 52.

[3] [The Protector, and his brother Lord Seymour of Sudley.—E.]

[4] P. 51.

than that Knox here proceeds on suppositions, and reasons from principles, which condemned separation from the Church of England as then established? Doth he not suppose that the Church of England, as then established, was Christ's *boat*, his Church—and that the Sons of the Church of England were Christ's disciples? Doth he not suppose that these two brothers, as *sons* of the Church of England, ought to have been "assuredly knit" together by Christian charity—that the breach between them was an "ungodly breach of that charity" by which members of that same Church ought to have been "assuredly knit together"—and that it was a contrivance of the *wicked* and *envious Papists* thereby to ruin the Church of England? Doth he not suppose all these as undoubted truths, I say; or rather, doth he not positively or expressly assert them? And now, if separation from the Church of England, and condemning her communion as an unlawful communion, can consist with these principles and suppositions; or if he who reasons on these suppositions, and from these principles, can be deemed at the same time to have been for the unlawfulness of the communion of the Church of England, I must confess I know not what it is to collect men's sentiments from their principles and reasonings.

Whoso pleases may find more of Knox's sentiments to this purpose in his "Exhortation to England for the speedy receiving of Christ's Gospel," dated from Geneva, January 12, 1559. For there he calls England "*happy*," in that "God, by the power of his verity of late years (i. e. in King Edward's time), had broken and destroyed the intolerable yoke of her spiritual captivity, and brought her forth as it had been from the bottom of hell, and from the thraldom of Satan, in which she had been holden, blinded by idolatry and superstition, to the fellowship of his angels, and the possession of that rich inheritance prepared to his dearest children with Christ Jesus his Son." And a little after he says of the Church of England, that in that same King Edward's days "she was a delectable garden planted by the Lord's own hand."[1] And in his letter to Secretary Cecil, from Dieppe, April 10, 1559, he tells him—"He expects

[1] P. 102.

that same favour from him which it becometh one member of Christ's body to have for *another*."[1] And in his letter to Queen Elizabeth from Edinburgh, 28th July 1559, he "renders thanks unfeignedly to God, that it hath pleased him in his eternal goodness to exalt her head to the manifestation of His glory, and the extirpation of idolatry."[2] Is this like the clamour which has been ordinary with our Presbyterians about the *idolatry* of the Church of England? And in the conclusion of that letter he prays that "the Spirit of the Lord Jesus may so rule her in all her actions and enterprizes, that in her God may be glorified, his Kirk edified, and she, as a lively member of the same, may be an example of virtue and godliness of life to all others." Are these like the sayings of one who in the meantime judged the communion of the Church of England an *unlawful communion?*

It is true, indeed, John Knox was displeased with some things in the English Liturgy. He thought she had some modes and ceremonies there which were scandalous, as symbolizing too much with the Papists, and it cannot be denied that he disturbed the peace of the English Church at Frankfort.[3] But, if I mistake not, he did so, not that he thought the terms of her communion truly sinful, but that he judged his *own*, or rather the Genevan *model*, *purer;* for it is reasonable to think he proceeded on the same principles, and was of the same sentiments with his master Calvin, and nothing can be clearer than that Calvin did not condemn the things scrupled at as impious or unlawful, but as not agreeable to his *standard* of *purity*, as appears from the citation in the note,[4] and might easily be made appear

[1] Knox's History, 224. [2] Ibid. 231.

[3] [On account of the great numbers of Englishmen who had left their country during the Marian persecution, an English church was opened at Frankfort, of which John Knox, who was then at Geneva, was chosen to be minister. An altercation arose among the members of this congregation concerning the Liturgy of the Church of England, and the ceremonies enjoined by the Rubric. For a time Knox, who was the leading man of those who opposed the Liturgy, prevailed, and succeeded in getting a garbled service compiled from the Anglican and Genevan Forms. But when Dr Cox, afterwards Bishop of Ely, came to Frankfort, he would not submit to such a mutilation; and after much dispute, during which Knox exhibited his usual violence, the Doctor triumphed, and the English service was introduced entire.—E.]

[4] In Anglicana Ecclesia (Liturgiâ), qualem describitis, multas video fuisse tolerabiles ineptias. His duobus verbis ex primo, non fuisse eam puri-

more fully, if one were put to it, but it is needless now, considering that all I aim at is that it cannot be inferred from what Knox did at Frankfort that he judged the communion of the Church of England an unlawful communion, though I must confess in making these stirs he proceeded not according to the true Catholic principles of Christian communion.

But enough of him at present. To proceed: As our Reformers thus generally looked upon the Church of England as a *true Church*, and her communion as a *lawful communion*, so after our Reformation was established, those of the Church of England had the same sentiments of the Church of Scotland. The ambassadors, who at any time for many years came from England to the Scottish Court, made no scruple to live in the communion of the Church of Scotland, and join in her public worship. Thus, the Earl of Bedford,[1] who came to assist at the solemnization[2] of the Prince's (afterwards King James the Sixth) baptism, anno 1566, went daily to sermon,[3] i. e. by a synecdoche very familiar in Scotland to the public worship. Neither did I ever observe

tatem, quæ optanda fuerat. Quæ tamen, primo statim die, corrigi non poterant vitia, cum NULLA SUBESSET MANIFESTA IMPIETAS, ferenda ad tempus fuisse. Calv. Angl. Francoford. inter Epist. Col. 213.

[1] Knox's History, 440.

[2] [He was baptized on the 17th December in the castle of Stirling, by Hamilton, the last Archbishop of St Andrews, of the ancient Hierarchy, who was afterwards ignominiously executed by order of the Regent Moray.—E.]

[3] [With the Presbyterians in Scotland the *sermon* is everything, and swallows up all external religion in itself. A man of devout character and untiring zeal is nothing, unless he be a good *preacher*. While the prayer is being offered in the public service, the congregation standing up and looking about them, appear as if they had no concern in it, the minister being the *sole mediator;* but when the sermon is commenced the people sit down, and every eye is fixed on the *preacher*, while he delivers his tradition. Even the purpose of the celebration of their Eucharist, (which in Scotland in the towns is administered only *twice* a year, and in many country places only *once*) is forgotten amid the accumulation of "words of man's wisdom," which are spoken at such times. Such solemnities are popularly known as the *Preachings*, from the number of sermons which are delivered, both before and after the Celebration; and this custom has a tendency to cause the minds of people to be more occupied with listening to these discoursings, than in praying that they may be able to realize those spiritual benefits which, judging from their formularies, they believe to accompany the faithful attendance upon the rite.—E.]

the least intimation, in any monument of these times I have seen, of these *two Churches* having *opposite communions* till many years after the Reformation. But I have insisted long enough on this consideration, the sum whereof is briefly this. Our Reformers, so far as can appear from their private sentiments and practices, looked upon the Church of England as a *true Christian Church*. They lived in her communion when they had occasion to be within her *bounds;* not *one* of them condemned her communion as an unlawful communion; not *one* of them set up conventicles in England when they were *there*, or erected *separate churches*, &c. From all which it seems to follow, at least very probably, that they reformed generally upon the *same principles*—entirely upon *the same* as to Church communion. The reason why I have insisted so long on this argument is that it smooths the way for the next, which is, 2. That our Reformers in their *public deeds openly* and *solemnly professed* that they were of *one religion*, *one communion*, with the Church of England. This, as I take it, is a point of considerable importance, and therefore I shall endeavour to set it at least in a competent light.

1. Then, *unity* of *religion*, and, by good consequence, I think, *oneness* of communion, between the Scottish and the English Protestants, was the great argument insisted on by the Scots in their addresses to England for assistance to turn out the French, and establish the Reformation in Scotland, anno 1559; and it was *one* of the *main grounds* on which all that great *revolution* was transacted that year and the next, viz. 1560. Take the account, as I have it, from that which is commonly called "Knox's History."

When the Lords of the Congregation found it would be necessary for them to implore foreign assistance for driving out the French, then the great obstacles to the Reformation, they resolved, in the first place, to apply to England, and the reason given for this resolution was, that ENGLAND WAS OF THE SAME RELIGION.[1] Or, if ye please, take it in

[1] [The best proof that can be offered of this is the fact that the Book of Common Prayer of King Edward VI. was read in the parish churches of Scotland. This is quite clearly stated in a letter from Kirkaldy of Grange, an eminent leader of the Reformers, to Sir Henry Percy, the MS. of which is in the State Paper Office. Vide Tytler, vol. vi. p. 117.—E.]

the author's own words[1]—"We thought good to seek aid and support of all Christian princes against her (the Queen Regent's) tyranny, in case we should be more sharply pursued; AND BECAUSE THAT ENGLAND WAS OF THE SAME RELIGION, and lay next unto us, it was thought expedient first to prove them," &c. It was rational enough to *try* there first, indeed, considering what I have already observed concerning Queen Elizabeth, and *tryed* it was, and *found* successful; for Secretary Cecil no sooner heard of their intention than he sent them word "that their enterprize misliked not the English Council."[2] Upon the sight of this great minister's letter, which brought them so comfortable news, they instantly returned an answer. Knox has it word for word.[3] I shall only take an abstract of what is proper for my present purpose. In short, then—"They perceive their messenger, Master Kirkaldy of Grange, hath found Cecil *an unfeigned favourer of Christ's true religion*. As touching the *assurance* of *a perpetual amity* to stand betwixt the *two realms*, as no earthly thing is more desired by them, so they crave of God to be made the instruments by which the unnatural debate which hath so long continued between the nations may be composed, *to the praise of God's name*, and *the comfort of the faithful in both realms*. If the *English wisdom* can *foresee* and *devise* how the same may be brought to pass, they may persuade themselves not only of the *Scottish consent* and *assistance*, but of their *constancy*, as *men can promise*, to their lives' end; and of *charge* and *commandment* to be *left* by *them* to *their posterity*, that the amity between the nations (IN GOD) contracted and begun may be by them kept *inviolate for ever*. Their confederacy, amity, and league, shall not be like the pactions made by worldly men, for worldly profit; but as they require it, for GOD'S CAUSE, so they will call upon His name for the observation of it. As this their confederacy requires secrecy, so, they doubt not, the English wisdom will communicate it only to such as they know to be favourers of such a GODLY CONJUNCTION; and, in *their* opinion, it would much help if the preachers, both in *persuasion* and in *public prayers* (as *theirs* in Scotland do), would *commend* the same unto the people. And

[1] Knox, 170. [2] Knox, 228. [3] Knox, ibid.

thus, after their most humble commendation to the Queen's Majesty (whose reign they wish may be prosperous and long, to the glory of God and comfort of His Church), they heartily commit him to the protection of the Omnipotent. Given at Edinburgh, July 17, anno 1559."

Before I proceed further, I must tell my reader that all our historians are extremely defective as to this great transaction between Scotland and England I am now accounting for. None of them, neither Buchanan, nor Lesly, nor Spottiswoode, hath this letter except Knox, and *he* calls it *the First Letter* to Sir William Cecil from the Lords of the Congregation, which imports there were *more*, as no doubt there were *many*, and yet he hath not so much as a *second*. Besides, I find by Knox, Buchanan, and Spottiswoode,[1] that in November 1559, Secretary Maitland was sent by the Lords of the Congregation to treat with the Queen of England. I find likewise that he managed the matter so, and brought it to such maturity, that immediately upon his return the league between the Queen of England and the Scottish Lords was transacted and finished; and yet I can nowhere find what *commission* he had, nor what *instructions;* how he managed his business, nor upon what terms the Queen of England and he came to an agreement; and several other such lamentable defects I find, so that it is not possible for me to give so exact a deduction of such an important matter as were to be wished; though, I doubt not, if it had been clearly and fully deduced, it might have brought great *light* to many things about our Reformation which now, so far as I know, are buried in obscurity. Any man may readily imagine how sensible one that would perform my present task must needs be of so great a disadvantage; however, when we cannot have what we *would*, we must satisfy ourselves the *best way* we *can*. And so I return to my purpose, which, though I cannot despatch so *punctually* as might be desired, yet I hope to do it sufficiently, and to the satisfaction of all *sober* though not *nicely critical* inquirers.

To go on then. By the afore-mentioned letter, you see, the Lords of the Congregation referred it to the *wisdom* of the English Council to "foresee and devise the means and

[1] Knox, 218; Spottiswoode, 140; Buchanan, 604.

assurances"—(they are the very words of the letter)—how one effectual *confederacy* might be made between them for *God's cause*. Now, let us reason a little upon the common principles of prudence, where *matter of fact* is so defective.

What was more natural for the English Council to require than that—now that the English Reformation was perfected and legally established, and the Scottish was only in forming—the Scots should engage to transcribe the English copy, and establish their Reformation upon that same *foot*, i. e. receive the *doctrine*, *worship*, *rites*, and *government* of the Church of England, so that there might be no difference between the two Churches, but *both* might be of the *same constitution*, so far as the necessary distinction of the two States would allow? The point in agitation was a *confederacy* in opposition to *Popery*, and for the security of the Reformed Religion in *both* kingdoms. It was obvious, therefore, to foresee that it would be the stronger, and every way the better suited to that great end, if both Churches stood on one bottom; for who sees not that *different constitutions* are apt to be attended with *different customs*, which in process of time may introduce *different sentiments* and *inclinations?* Who sees not that the smallest differences are apt to create jealousies, divisions, cross-interests, and that there is nothing more necessary than *uniformity* for preserving *unity?* Besides, Queen Elizabeth was peculiarly concerned to crave this. There is nothing more necessary to support a State, especially a monarchy, than *unity* of *religion*. It was for the support of her State, the security of her monarchy, that she was to enter into this confederacy. She was afraid of the Queen of Scotland's pretensions to the Crown of England. For this cause she was *confederating* with the Queen of Scotland's subjects, that she might have them of *her side*. It was her concern, therefore, to have them as much secured to her interests as possibly she could. They were then at a great bay without her succour, and had referred it to her and her Council, to foresee and devise the terms on which she would grant it. And now, laying all these things together, what was more natural, I say, than that she should demand that they should be of the *same religion*, and their Church of the *same constitution*, with the Church of England?

This politic was so very obvious, that it is not to be imagined she and her wise Council could overlook it; and though it had been nowhere upon record that she craved it, yet the common sense of mankind would stand for its credibility. What shall we say, then, if we find it recorded by an historian whose honesty is not to be questioned in this matter? And such an *one* we have—even Buchanan himself—though he misplaces it, and narrates it a long time after it was done, and as it were only by the bye.

The occasion on which he records this is when, in the year 1569—the tenth year after this confederacy between the Scots and the English was concerted, as I take it, the Earl of Moray, then Regent, had gone to the northern parts of the kingdom to settle matters there, accounts were brought to him of the Duke of Norfolk's conspiracy, which was so well compacted and so deep laid, that it was judged morally impossible to disappoint it; and Moray's friends were earnest with him to retreat in time, and disengage himself of the opposite party with whom he had hitherto sided. And so, when Buchanan comes to give the history of this juncture, he, to find a just rise for his narration, returns no less than ten years backward, discoursing thus—"The state of English affairs obliges me to look back a little, because in these times the interests of both kingdoms were so twisted, that the concerns of the *one* cannot be represented without the *other*. The Scots, some years before, being delivered from the Gallican slavery by the English assistance, had subscribed to the religious worship and rites of the Church of England; and that surprizing change in affairs seemed to promise to Britain quietness and rest from all intestine commotions and factions," &c.[1]

Here, you see, the thing is plainly and undeniably asserted, yet so careless, to say no worse, have all our historians been that not one of them mentions it but he, and he does no more than mention it; and to this minute

[1] Status rerum Anglicarum, hic nos paulum divertere cogit, quod eo tempore adeo utriusque, regni prospera et adversa, conjuncta erant, ut altera sine alteris explicari nequirent. Scoti, ante aliquot annos, Anglorum auxiliis, e servitute Gallica liberati, RELIGIONIS CULTUI ET RITIBUS CUM ANGLIS COMMUNIBUS SUBSCRIPSERUNT. Ea subita rerum mutatio spondere videbatur Britanniam universam ab omni domestico tumultu conquieturam. E continenti vero, &c. Buchanan, 714.

we are generally in the dark when, how, by whom, and with what solemnities, it was done. Buchanan's words would seem to import that it was done after *that* our *deliverance*, as he calls it, was accomplished, but not one word of it in the Treaty concluded at Leith, and proclaimed July 8th, 1560. which succeeded immediately upon the back of that *deliverance* ; not one word of it, I say, in that Treaty, as it is either in Buchanan, Knox, or Spottiswoode, or any other historian I have had occasion to see ; neither have we any other public transaction or deed that mentions it.

I find it told by several historians,[1] that the Earls of Morton and Glencairn were sent to England, after that *our deliverance*, to return thanks to Queen Elizabeth for her assistance. It is possible it might have been done then, for as Spottiswoode has it—" After the professors heard of the cold entertainment that Sir James Sandilands, who went to France to give an account of the Treaty, had got at that Court, their minds were greatly troubled, for they were sensible of their own weakness, and doubtful of support from England if France should again invade, because of the loss the English had received in the late expedition ; neither," he says, " had the Earls of Morton and Glencairn, who upon breaking up of the Parliament were sent into England to render thanks to the Queen, and to entreat the continuance of her favour, given any advertisement of their acceptance." If upon this occasion, commission was sent to these two Earls to subscribe, in name of the rest of the Protestants, to such an *union* in *religion*, it exactly answers Buchanan's account; but no such thing is so much as insinuated to have been done on that occasion. For my part, I humbly offer it to be considered, whether it is not possible that Buchanan intended not to lay any such stress upon the word LIBERATI, as thereby to import that it was *after* the accomplishment of *our deliverance* that the Scots subscribed ; but bringing in the whole matter occasionally where he mentions it, and intending to despatch it in as few words as he could, he did not stand nicely upon the wording of it. And if this holds, the most rational and natural account will be that Secretary Maitland and Sir Robert Melville, who

[1] Buchanan, 614 ; Knox, 284 ; Spottiswoode, 151.

were sent by the Scottish Lords, in the beginning of November 1559, to implore the Queen of England's assistance, were impowered to agree, in name of the *whole body*, to this *union* of *religion*, if it should be demanded. That the Secretary had power to treat, and agree to, and sign Articles, is certain; for amongst the Instructions given to the commissioners for concluding the Treaty at Berwick, dated at Glasgow, February 10, 1559-60, I find this as one[1]—"*Item*, If it shall be desired of you to confirm for us, and in our name, the things past and granted by our former commissioner, the young Laird of Lethington, ye shall, in all points, for us, and in our name, confirm the same, so far as it shall make either for the WELL and CONJUNCTION of the two realms or this PRESENT CAUSE, or yet for the security of our part for fulfilling of the same."[2] This, I say, is one of the Articles of these Instructions, from which it is evident that Lethington had signed Articles in England, though we are no where told what they were. And may it not pass for a probable conjecture, that *that* concerning *unity* in *religious worship* and *ceremonies* was one of them? But *whensoever* or by *whomsoever* it was done, is not the *critical hinge* of the controversy. We have Buchanan's word for it that it was *done;* and I hope my Presbyterian brethren will not hastily reject *his authority*, especially considering that his *veracity* in this matter is so much assisted and made credible by the strain of the letter directed to Secretary Cecil, on which we have already insisted. Neither is this all.

For, 2. The *public thanksgiving* and *prayers* made with great solemnity in St Giles' church in Edinburgh,[3] after the Pacification at Leith in July 1560, amount to no less than a fair demonstration of an *entire union* between the two nations as to Church matters and religion, for on that occasion it was thus addressed to Almighty God, with the common consent, and as a public deed of our Scottish Reformers—"Seeing that nothing is more odious in thy presence, O Lord, than is ingratitude, and violation of an *oath* and *covenant* made in thy name, and seeing thou hast made our *confederates* in *England* the *instruments* by whom we are

[1] Knox, 236. [2] Knox, 244. [3] Knox, 259, &c.

now set at this *liberty*, and to whom *in Thy name* we have *promised mutual faith again*. Let us never fall to that unkindness, O Lord, that either we declare ourselves unthankful unto them, or prophaners of Thy holy name. Confound thou the counsel of those that go about to break THAT MOST GODLY LEAGUE CONTRACTED IN THY NAME, and *retain* thou us so *firmly* together by the power of thy Holy Spirit, that Satan have never power to set us again at variance nor discord. Give us Thy grace to live in that Christian charity which thy Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, hath so earnestly commanded to all the members of His body, that other nations, provoked by our example, may set aside all ungodly war, contention, and strife, and study to live in tranquillity and peace, as it becometh the sheep of thy pasture, and the people that daily look for our final deliverance by the coming again of our Lord Jesus," &c. Thus it was prayed, I say, in great solemnity at that time, and every petition is a confirmation of Buchanan's *fidelity* and my *assertion*.

Further yet, 3. In the old Scottish Liturgy, compiled in these times, and afterwards used publicly in all the churches, there is "a thanksgiving unto God, after our deliverance from the tyranny of the *Frenchmen*, with prayers made for the continuance of the peace betwixt the realms of Scotland and England;" wherein we have these petitions offered—"Grant unto us, O Lord, that with such reverence we may remember Thy benefits received, that, after this, in our default, we never enter into *hostility* against the realm and nation of England. Suffer us never, O Lord, to fall to that ingratitude and detestable unthankfulness, that we should seek the destruction and death of those whom Thou hast made instruments to deliver us from the tyranny of merciless strangers. Dissipate Thou the counsels of such as deceitfully travel to stir the hearts of the inhabitants of either realm against the other. Let their malicious practices be their own confusion; and grant Thou of Thy mercy that love, concord, and tranquillity, may continue and increase amongst the inhabitants of this isle, even to the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whose glorious Gospel Thou of Thy mercy dost CALL US BOTH TO UNITY, PEACE, AND CHRISTIAN CONCORD, the full PERFECTION whereof we shall

possess in the fulness of Thy kingdom,"[1] &c. Here is a set of demonstrations to the same purpose also. And now let any man lay all these things together—the *Letter* to Cecil, the *Confederacy* betwixt Scotland and England, Buchanan's testimony, and these *thanksgivings* and *prayers*, and then let him judge impartially whether or not there is reason to believe, that in those days, there was a good agreement between the Scottish and English Protestants, as to religion and Church matters.[2]

[1] [Knox's Liturgy. Ed. Lond. 1840, p. 42-3.—E.]

[2] [This conclusion of Bishop Sage is contradicted by the learned Mr Tytler, the historian of Scotland, who gives it as his opinion, that Elizabeth purposely waived the question of religion, in all her formal compacts with the Scottish Reformers—and that "she agreed to support them with her army, on the sole ground that they had taken up arms to preserve the liberty of their country, and to expel the French, who, through Scotland, threatened her own dominions, and questioned her title to the throne," Tytler's History of Scotland, vol. vi. p. 173, 174. Certainly there are some grounds for this opinion in the fact, that neither in the Treaties of Berwick nor Edinburgh, concluded in 1560, are any express provisions in favour of the Reformed religion included; upon which omission Mr Tytler passes the following severe remarks, which, we must confess, are not *altogether undeserved* by the Scottish Reformers.—"This transaction presents us with a somewhat mortifying view of the early Reformers in this country, when we find that, after all the solemn warnings denounced against trusting too exclusively to an arm of flesh, Knox, who then acted as secretary to the Congregation in the West, and Balnaves, who filled the same situation in the Council established at Glasgow, consented to purchase the co-operation of mere human power, *by omitting all allusion to the great cause of religious reformation*, which they had so repeatedly represented as the paramount object for which they had taken up arms, and were ready to sacrifice their lives."—Ibid. vol. vi. p. 154. It is impossible at this distance of time, to say what were the precise reasons of this omission; but in justice to the Reformers it must not be forgotten, that among their first applications to England for assistance, they *put religion forward* as a ground of their appeal, and in all their correspondence on the subject, they *dwell particularly upon it*. Thus, in answer to a question to the Lords of the Congregation, contained in a letter from Cecil to Sir Henry Percy, and communicated to them by Kirkaldy of Grange, as to "what the Protestants of Scotland do purpose?" their reply was—"Our whole and only purpose, as God knoweth, is to *advance the glory of Christ Jesus, the true preaching of His Gospel within this realm, to remove superstition and all sort of external idolatry, to bridle to our powers the fury of those that heretofore have cruelly shed the blood of our brethren, and to our uttermost to maintain the liberty of this our country from the tyranny and thraldom of strangers.*" First Letter to Sir William Cecil from the Lords of the Congregation, Knox's History, fol. ed. London, 1644, p. 222. It is plain that at this

Thus, I think, I have sufficiently cleared that our Reformers *generally*, if not *unanimously*, looked upon the Church of England as so *well* constituted, that they acknowledged *her communion* to be a *lawful communion*. But before I proceed to other things, I must try if I can make any more advantage of what has been said; and I reason thus. Was there not here *truly* and *really* a confederacy, an oath, a *solemn league and covenant*, betwixt the Scottish and the English Protestants? Were not these English Protestants then *united* in *that society* which, at that time, was and ever since hath been called the *Church of England?* And was not the *Church of England* of that very same constitution *then*, that it was of in King Charles I.'s time, for example, anno 1642? But if so, then, I ask again, was not this *solemn league and covenant* made thus by our Reformers with *their brethren* in England, as much designed for the security, the defence, the maintenance, of *the Church of England*, as then by law established, as for the establishment of our Reformation? Did not our Reformers *promise mutual faith* to the English, as well as the English *promised to them?* Would it have been consistent with the mutual bonds and obligations of this confederacy, this *solemn league and covenant*, for the Scottish Reformers to have raised an army at that time against Queen Elizabeth, to invade her

crisis of their negotiation, they made *religion* the plea of their appeal, *even before that of French bondage*, and as we see from the passage of this same letter quoted by Bishop Sage, p. 155, 156, the *religious* nature of the compact was insisted on as the surest pledge of its being faithfully observed. And if the Reformed faith was omitted afterwards, the omission very probably arose on the part of Elizabeth and her agents, who looked rather to the danger which threatened England if France should gain supreme rule in Scotland, than to the cause of the Scottish Reformation. Whether Knox and his party ought to have accepted assistance, without expressly declaring at the time *all* the reasons why it was required, is quite another thing, although their not having done so was by no means singular; for in cases of emergency people are not in the habit of stopping to explain, but grasp at relief, and when the danger is past, think it then time enough to enter into explanations, and give utterance to their joy. This was just what the Reformers did, see the passages quoted, p. 161. Now, if in addition to these things, *Buchanan's positive testimony*, and the other probable arguments adduced by our author in this place, be taken into consideration, the reader will, we think, be more inclined to adhere to the conclusion of Bishop Sage, than to the opinion of the learned Historian of Scotland.—E.]

dominions, in order to ruin the Church of England? I cannot imagine any sober person can grudge to grant me this much also. But if this be granted, then I ask, in the third place, did not that *solemn league and covenant* made by our Reformers with *those* of the Church of England, run in a direct opposition to the *Solemn League and Covenant* made by our Scottish Presbyterians with a factious party in England, for *destroying* the Church of England, in King Charles I.'s time? Nay, did not our Scottish Presbyterians in that King's time, by entering into that *Solemn League and Covenant*, directly and effrontedly *break* through *the charge and commandment* which our Reformers left to their posterity—that the *amity* betwixt the "nations in God contracted and begun, might by them be kept inviolate for ever?" Nay, further yet, did not our Reformers solemnly *pray* against those who made the *Solemn League and Covenant* in the days of King Charles I.? Did they not address to God that he would *dissipate their counsels*, and *let their malicious practices be their own confusion?* And now let the world judge what rational pretences these Presbyterians, in that holy Martyr's time, and, by consequence, our present Presbyterians, can make for their being the *only true* and *genuine successors* of our first Reformers? Expecting solid and serious answers to these questions, I shall now advance in the prosecution of my main undertaking on this head, which was to shew how our Reformers agreed with the Church of England in several momentous matters relative to the Constitution and Communion, the Government and Polity of the Church, &c. But because I have insisted so long on this general one, which I have just now taken leave of, I shall only instance in two or three more, and despatch them as speedily as I can.

2. Then it is evident and undeniable that our Scottish Protestants for some years used the Liturgy of the Church of England[1] in their public devotions. Indeed, the very first

[1] [This much disputed fact is now for ever set at rest, by the letter of Kirkaldy of Grange to Sir Robert Percy above referred to, vide note, p. 81. It speaks volumes in confirmation of our author's general argument, for if the Scottish Reformers could receive Edward VI.'s Liturgy, they could not have been violently opposed to the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England, and must have entertained sentiments widely different from those who in *this* day boast of their descent from, and identity

public step towards our Reformation, made by the Lords of the Congregation, was to appoint this Liturgy to be used. It was ordered upon the third day of December 1557, as both Knox and Calderwood have it.[1] Take the Ordinance in Knox's words—"The Lords and Barons professing Christ Jesus, convened frequently in Council, in the which, these heads were concluded: First, It is thought expedient, advised, and ordained, That in all parishes of this realm the *Common Prayer* be read weekly on Sunday and other Festival days, publicly in the parish churches, with the *Lessons* of the Old and New Testament, conformable to the Book of Common Prayers; and if the curates of the parishes be qualified, that they read the same, and if they be not, or if they refuse, that the most qualified in the parish use and read the same," &c. Spottiswoode and Petrie[2] give the same account; but such is the genius of Mr Calderwood, that you are to expect few things which may make against the Presbyterian interests *candidly* and *sincerely* represented by him. For instance, in his overly account of this matter he quite omits the mention of other *Holidays* besides *Sundays*.

These consistent testimonies of all those four historians are so full and plain a demonstration of the matter of fact, that I cannot foresee so much as one objection that can be made, or one evasion that can be thought on, unless it be that it is not said by any of them that it was the *Book* of the *Common Prayers* of the Church of England. But this difficulty is soon removed.

For, 1. It was either the *Book* of *the Common Prayers* of the Church of England, or the *Genevan Liturgy*. For we no where read of a *third* ever pretended to have been used in those times in Scotland. Now, that it was not the Liturgy of Geneva is plain, for besides that it is utterly incredible that there could have been so *many* copies of the Genevan form, in

of doctrine with Knox, Winram, Erskine, and the other overthrowers of the Ante-Reformation Church. It argues singular blindness in such persons to talk at random, as they very often do, about the *Popery* of the *present* English Liturgy, when those "*worthies*" whom they delight to honour, did not scruple to use the previous Service-Book, wherein the doctrines to which they ignorantly ascribe the epithet "*Popish*," are enunciated with greater plainness and candour.—E.]

[1] Knox, 112; Calderwood, 5.

[2] Spottiswoode, 117; Petrie, 192.

the vulgar language then in Scotland as might serve so *many* parish churches; nay, that it is highly probable there was not so much as *one;*—besides this, I say, in the Genevan Form, which was afterwards used in Scotland, there is no *order* for, no *footstep* of, the observation of *other Holidays* besides *Sunday*. Neither is there any *Order* in it for reading of Lessons of the Old and New Testament, except in the treatise of fasting, which was not compiled till the year 1565. There, indeed, lessons are appointed, such and such Psalms, and such and such histories in the *Old*, but not so much as *one tittle* of the *New* Testament. In all the rest of the book a *deep silence* about *lessons*—than which there cannot be a clearer demonstration, that the book appointed to be used in December 1557, was not that of Geneva. Indeed, 2. None of our Presbyterian historians, neither Petrie nor Calderwood, have the confidence to pretend, nay, to insinuate, the possibility of its being the *Common Order* of *Geneva*, which, it is very probable, they would have done, if they had had the smallest hopes of making it feasible. On the contrary, Calderwood seems fairly to acknowledge that it was the *English Liturgy*; but then this acknowledgment lies at such a distance from the year 1557, that no doubt he thought himself pretty secure, that few readers would reflect upon it as an acknowledgment. He doth not make it till he comes to the year 1623, when he had occasion to tell how the use of the English Liturgy was brought into the New College of St Andrews. Take it in his own words[1]—"Upon the 15th of January, Master Robert Howie, Principal of the New College of St Andrews, Doctor Wedderburn, and Doctor Melvin, were directed, by a letter from Doctor Young, in the King's name, to use the *English Liturgy* morning and evening in the New College, where all the students were present at morning and evening prayers, which was presently put in execution, notwithstanding they wanted the warrant of any General Assembly, or of any CONTINUED PRACTICE OF THE FORM in time bypast since the Reformation." Where, you see, he lays the stress of his argument against it, on its not having a *continued practice* since the Reformation, which is a clear concession that at the Reformation it was in *practice*, though that *practice* was not *continued*.

[1] Calderwood, 800.

But whether he acknowledged this or not is no great matter; we have sufficient evidence for the point in hand without it. For, 3. Buchanan's testimony, which was adduced before, about the "Scots subscribing to the worship and rites of the Church of England," is unexceptionable. And yet it is not all. For, 4. The Order, as you see it appointed by the Lords of the Congregation, December 3, 1557, is, that the book there authorized be used in all churches from that very date; but we find by the "First Book of Discipline,"[1] that the Order of Geneva was only coming in to be used then in *some* of the churches, i. e. 1560, and it had nothing like a public establishment till the General Assembly holden at Edinburgh, December 25, 1562. For *then*, and not till *then*, it was "concluded, that an uniform order should be kept in the ministration of the Sacraments, solemnization of Marriages, and burial of the Dead, according to the Kirk of *Geneva*." So it is in the MSS. and so Petrie hath it;[2] but nature works again with Calderwood, for he has no more but this—"It was ordained that an uniform order be kept in the ministration of the Sacraments, according to the Book of Geneva,"[3]—omitting Marriage and the Burial of the Dead—*Marriage*, I believe, to bear the *other* company, for the *Burial of the Dead* was the *Dead Flea*. Why? The Book of Geneva allowed of *Funeral Sermons*, as he himself acknowledgeth[4]—a mighty superstition! in the opinion of Presbyterians, so that it would have been offensive to the *sincerer sort*, as he commonly calls those of his own gang, and inconsistent with the exigencies of the *good cause*, to have let the world know that a *General Assembly* had *ratified* the Order of that Book about *Burials*, and thereby had *justified* the *superstition* of *funeral sermons*.

Nay, 5, It seems this Act of the General Assembly, December 1562, has not been strong enough for turning out the English Liturgy and introducing the Form of Geneva. For if we may believe Calderwood himself,[5] the General Assembly holden at Edinburgh, December 25, 1564, found themselves concerned to make another Act, ordaining "every Minister, Exhorter, and Reader, to have one of the Psalm-

[1] Spottiswoode, 153. [2] Petrie, 233. [3] Calderwood, 32.
[4] Ibid. 24. [5] Ibid. 39.

Books lately printed at Edinburgh, and use the Order contained therein in prayers, marriage, and administration of the Sacraments;"—where, observe further, that prayers not mentioned in the Act 1562 are now put in, from which it may be probably conjectured, that as much as Knox was against the English Liturgy, he found many difficulties to get it laid aside—so many, that it has not only been used by some, few or many I cannot tell, in the Ministration of the Sacraments, &c., after the Act 1562. But the clergy have not found themselves obliged to forbear the use of it in the public prayers, so that it was needful, in this Assembly 1564, to make a new Act, restricting them both as to *prayers* and *other ministrations* to the *Order* of *Geneva*. And if this holds, we have the English Liturgy at least *seven years* in continued practice in Scotland. But it is enough for my main purpose that it was once universally in use, which, I think, cannot be denied by any who impartially considers what hath been said.

And now, 6. May not I adduce one testimony more? It is true it is of a later date, but it is very plain and positive, and what I have adduced already is security enough for its credibility. It is the testimony of the compilers of our *Scottish Liturgy*, which made the great *stir* in the year 1637, and was made one of the main pretences for the first eruptions of that execrable Rebellion which ensued. The compilers of that Liturgy, I say, in their Preface to it tell us, that "it was then known, that divers years after the Reformation, we had no other Order for Common Prayer but the English Liturgy." A third principle wherein our Reformers agreed with the Church of England, and which stands in direct contradiction to the principles of our Presbyterians, is, that they owned "the Church had a great dependence on the State—that it belonged to the civil magistrate to reform the Church—that people might appeal from the Church to the civil magistrate," &c.

I am not now to enter into the controversy concerning the *dependence* or *independence* of the Church upon the State. That falls not within the compass of my present undertaking. Neither will I say that our Presbyterians are in the wrong, as to the true substantial matter agitated in that controversy. All I am concerned for at present is, that in these

times, those of the Church of England owned a great dependence of the Church upon the State, and that our Reformers agreed with them in that principle; and I think I may make short work of it, for that that was the principle of the Church of England in these times I think no man can readily deny, who knows any thing about her at, and a good many years after, her Reformation. All my business is to shew that our Reformers were of that *same principle*, and I think that shall be easily made to appear; for as to the civil magistrate's power to reform the Church, what can be more clear than the petition presented to the Queen-Regent in November 1558? There our Reformers tell her Majesty,[1] that "knowing no order placed in this realm but her Majesty and her grave Council, set to amend as well the disorder ecclesiastical as the defaults in the temporal regiment, they do most humbly prostrate themselves before her feet, asking justice and her gracious help against such as falsely traduced and accused them as heretics and schismatics," &c. In which address we have these two things very clear and evident—1. That they owned that the civil magistrate had power to amend *ecclesiastical disorders* as well as *temporal:* 2. That in consequence of this they applied to the civil magistrate for protection against the pursuits of the Church. And in their Protestation given to the Parliament about that same time, "they most humbly beseech the sacred authority, to think of them as faithful and obedient subjects, and take them into its protection, keeping that indifferency which becometh God's lieutenants to use towards those who, in his name, do call for defence against cruel oppressors," &c.—meaning the then Churchmen.[2] Indeed, none clearer for this than Knox himself, as is to be seen fully in his "Appellation from the Cruel and most unjust Sentence pronounced against him by the false Bishops and Clergy of Scotland," as he himself names it, for there[3] he lays down and endeavours to prove this assertion—"That it is lawful to God's prophets, and to preachers of Christ Jesus, to appeal from the sentence and judgment of the visible Church, to the knowledge of the temporal magistrate, who by God's

[1] Knox, 130; Spottiswoode, 118. [2] Knox, 136; Spottiswoode, 120.
[3] Knox, Appendix, 4.

law is bound to hear their causes, and defend them from tyranny." And in that same "Appellation"[1] he largely asserts and maintains the *dependence* of the Church upon the State. "The ordering and reformation of religion, with the instruction of subjects," he says, "doth appertain especially to the civil magistrate." For why?—"Moses had great power in the matters of religion. God revealed nothing particularly to Aaron, the churchman, but commanded him to depend from the mouth of Moses, the civil magistrate. Moses was empowered to separate Aaron and his sons for the priesthood. Aaron and his sons were subject to Moses. Moses was so far preferred to Aaron that the one commanded, the other obeyed. The Kings of Israel were commanded to read the Book of the Law all the days of their lives, not only for their own private edification, but for the public preservation of religion. So David, Solomon, Asa, Jehosophat, Hezekiah, Josiah, understood it, and interested themselves in the matters of the Church accordingly. From which it is evident, saith he, "that the reformation of religion in all points, together with the punishment of false teachers, doth appertain to the power of the civil magistrate; for what God required of them, His justice must require of others having the like charge and authority; what He did approve in them, He cannot but approve in all others who, with like zeal and sincerity, do enterprize to purge the Lord's temple and sanctuary." Thus Knox, I say, in that "Appellation." I do not concern myself with the truth or falsehood of his positions, neither am I to justify or condemn his arguments. All I am to make of it is, to ask my Presbyterian brethren whether these principles of Knox's suit well with declining the civil magistrate as an incompetent judge in ecclesiastical matters?—with refusing to appear before him *prima instantia* for the trial of doctrines preached in the pulpit?—with the famous distinction of the King's having power about Church matters *cumulative* but not *privative?* &c. I am afraid it shall be hard enough to reconcile them.

I shall only instance in one principle more, which seems to have been common to *our* and the *English Reformers*, but it is one of very weighty consequence and importance to my

[1] P. 13, 14, 15, 16, &c.

main design. It is, fourthly, that excellent *Rule* of *reformation*, viz.—"That it be done according to the Word of God, interpreted by the monuments and writings of the Primitive Church." That ancient, solid, approven *Rule*—that *Rule* so much commended by that excellent writer Vincentius Lirinensis[1]—that *Rule* which the common sense of mankind cannot but *justify*, when it is considered soberly and seriously, without partiality or prejudice—a *Rule*, indeed, which had the Reformers of the several Churches followed *unitedly* and *conscientiously*, in those times when the Churches in the western parts of Europe were a reforming, we had not had so many different faiths, so many different modes of worship, so many different governments and disciplines, as, alas! this day divide the Protestant Churches,[2] and by consequence weaken the Protestant interest—a *Rule* which, had the pretenders to Reformed Religion in Scotland still stood by, we had not possibly had so many *horrid rebellions*, so many *unchristian divisions*, so many *unaccountable revolutions*, both in Church and State, as, to our sad experience, have in the result so unhinged all the principles of natural justice and honesty, and disabled, nay, eaten out the principles of Christianity amongst us, that now we are not disposed so

[1] Aliter namque illam (scripturam) Novatianus, aliter Sabellius, aliter Donatus, &c. exponit. Atqui idcirco multum necesse est, propter tantos tam varii erroris anfractus, ut Propheticæ et Apostolicæ interpretationis linea, secundum Ecclesiastici et Catholici sensus Normam dirigatur. Vin. Lir. Commonit. cap. 2.

[2] [Among those Churches having the Apostolical Succession, which abjure the "Pope's supremacy," there are not these differences of which our author speaks; but, on the contrary, an unity of doctrine has been preserved, which, all things considered, is truly wonderful. Under the general title of "Protestant Churches," evidently used in this place in the *popular* sense, our author seems to include many communities professing Christianity, which he would have been the last person to reckon as portions of the Holy Catholic Church. Churchmen in these days, find themselves frequently falling into the same way of speaking of the Christian communions, who have discarded "Apostolic Order." But it is a pity not to be very particular in this matter, for we have too good reason to believe, that unguarded admissions of this sort are misinterpreted, both by persons not instructed in the true principles of Episcopacy, and by Roman Catholics, who make such admissions on our parts a ground for affirming the alleged sectarian character of our Church, and confounding her with the schismatical and heretical bodies which have arisen since the sixteenth century.—E.]

much for any thing as downright atheism. But were our Reformers indeed for this *Rule?* That shall be demonstrated by and by, when we shall have occasion to bring it in again as naturally, to which opportunity I now refer it. In the meantime let us briefly sum up all that hath been hitherto said, and try to what it amounts.

I have, I think, made it appear, that while our Reformation was a carrying on, and when it was established, anno 1560, there was no such controversy agitated in the Churches as that concerning the *indispensible necessity* of *Presbytery*, and the *unlawfulness of Prelacy*—concerning the *Divine right* of *parity*, or the *unallowableness of imparity*, amongst the governors of the Church. I have said enough to make it credible that our Scottish Reformers had no peculiar occasions, opportunities, provocations, abilities, for falling on that controversy, or determining of it, more than Reformers of other Churches. In consequence of this I have further shewed, that from all the monuments of these times I have seen, not so much as *one* of our Reformers can be adduced, as asserting the *Presbyterian side* of this controversy. Lastly, I have, I think, made it evident, that our Reformers went very much upon the *same principles* on which the *English* Reformers went, who still continued Episcopacy; unquestionably on *many principles* of great weight and importance as to the constitution and communion, the government and polity of the Church, which staid in direct opposition and contradiction to the *principles* of our *present* Presbyterians. And now let any judicious and impartial person lay these things together, and then let him ingenuously determine, whether it be not highly incredible that our Reformers were for the *Divine institution* and *indispensible right* of *parity*, and the *unlawfulness* of *Prelacy*, which is the *principle*, at least the *profession*, of our *present* Presbyterians. Yet, after all this, I must tell my reader that I have insisted on these things so much as I have done, principally for smoothing the way for the evidences I am yet to produce, for the certainty of *my side* of the "Second Inquiry." And I am content that these things I have already discoursed should pass for no more than *rational presumptions*, till I have tried if *more strength* can be added to them, and they can be rendered *more cogent* and *concluding* by a succession of plain, positive, direct, and

formal proofs of my assertion; and to engage my reader's attention, I dare adventure to promise him that, to as high a degree as the nature of the thing is capable of, at least can reasonably bear; and so, without further address, I thus proceed.

Before our Reformation was established by law, our Reformers *addressed* to the Government by several *petitions* that *religion* and the *Church* might be *reformed*. I shall take notice of *three*, all pertinent to my purpose. One of them is no where, that I have seen, set down at length; the other two are in Knox's History. *That* which is no where set down at length is to be seen abridged in Buchanan, Lesly, and Spottiswoode,[1] but with some little variation, for Buchanan has given that Article, which I am at present concerned about, according to his way, in general terms, thus—"*Ut ministrorum electio, juxta antiquam Ecclesiæ consuetudinem, penes populum esset.*" Spottiswoode has translated Buchanan's words faithfully enough in this matter, as he doth in many other things; but Lesly gives it a little more distinctly, thus—"*Ut* EPISCOPI *deinceps, et* PASTORES, *illi Dominorum ac Nobilium cujuscunque* DIOCESIS, *hi* PAROCHORUM *assensione ac voluntate, ad* BENEFICIA *cooptentur.*" That this Petition, thus abridged by these three historians, was a Petition different from that which we have published at length in Knox, seems unquestionable, for that which is in Knox has not one syllable about the election of ministers; and beside, Buchanan fairly insinuates that there was another, *distinct* from that which he had abridged, though not much *different*. For thus he discourses[2]—"*Papani Edinburgi, ad eadem* FERE *postulata quæ per Nobilitatem ad eam, Reginam proreqem, sunt delata,* PENE *paribus usi sunt Responsis.*" Now, if it had been the *same* Petition, why would he have said, "*ad eadem* FERE *postulata*," and "PENE *paribus Responsis?*" This I take notice of, that my Presbyterian brethren may not have occasion to cavil at the Article as it is in Lesly, as if it were not genuine because it is not in the Petition recorded by Knox, and from him most imperfectly abridged by Calderwood, their two great and authentic historians; for as for Mr Petrie, he was so *wise* as not

[1] Buchanan, 586; Lesly, 504; Spottiswoode, 119. [2] Buchanan, 587.

to trouble himself with *either* of these Petitions, perceiving, belike, that *neither* of them was favourable to his beloved *parity*.

To proceed, now, with the Article as it is in Lesly. If he has set it down faithfully, I think we have a *fair* account of the sentiments of our Reformers concerning *Mother Parity*[1] —so very *fair*, that he who runs may read it. The question then is, whether Lesly has faithfully transmitted this Article to us? And for the affirmative, I offer these reasons.

1. There is no reason to doubt of his *integrity* in this matter; he was a *zealous* Papist, and a *Bishop* to boot. And it is evident, as he was *either* of these, it was not his interest to make our Reformers such *friends* to *Episcopacy* if they were not *such* really. For if they had not made that distinction between Bishops and Presbyters—if they had professed the *Divine right* of *parity*, he had had good ground for accusing them of receding from the undoubted principles and universal practice of the Catholic Church, in all times and in all places, in a point of so great weight and consequence in the government of the Church—an occasion which one of his zeal for his party would not probably have neglected to take hold of; far less would he have *lied* so palpably to save the reputation of his adversaries.

2. As he had no temptation to *falsify* in this matter, so he had all other qualifications of a *credible witness*. He lived in these times; he himself was a clergyman then; probably, he was a member of that same Convocation to which the Petition was offered; and I think no man will doubt of his abilities to comprehend such a matter.

Indeed, 3. If he forged this Article, he was *ridiculously impudent* at forging, for as he did it without any imaginable necessity, without any shadow of a degree of subserviency to his cause—so he put himself upon a necessity of forging more, even a good long *answer*, which, he says, was returned to that Article by the Convocation, viz.—"That it was not reasonable they should alter the method of electing Bishops and Presbyters prescribed by the Canon Law, especially in the time of the Queen's non-age. Her prerogative was interested in the matter; she with the Pope's consent had

[1] King James, Bas. Dor. 160, calls Parity the Mother of Confusion, &c.

power to nominate the Prelates; and to take that power out of her hands without her consent, or before she came to perfect age, was notoriously as well as undutifully to invade her royalty."[1] An *Answer*, indeed, exactly *fitted* for the *Article*, as he hath transmitted it.

4. But the truth is, that he neither forged the Article, nor the Convocation's answer to it, we have further undoubted evidence; for I have seen an old manuscript Scottish History, which I can produce if I am put to it, which exactly agrees with Lesly as to the Article; for thus it hath it—"The election of the Bishops and Kirkmen to pass by the temporal Lords, and people of their dioceses and parishes." And Buchanan, upon the matter, gives that same account of the Convocation's answer, affirming, that —"As to the election of ministers they answered, that such matters were to be regulated by the Canon Law, or the Decrees of the Council of Trent."[2]

5. Neither will it be found of any force to say, that Buchanan has not the Article, nor Spottiswoode, whose interest it was to have had it, if such a thing had been, considering his principles, and what was one of his principal designs in writing his History. This is of no force, I say; for first, as for Buchanan, it is evident from the whole tract of his History that he aimed principally at matters of State, bringing in Church matters only by the by, as we say, so that it is no wonder if he did not record them accurately, and with all the preciseness of nicety. And yet, even as he sums up the Petition, he has something in it which plainly imports the petitioners had no thought to interrupt the continuation of *imparity*, for thus he puts the last Article—"If, by the negligence of former times, ignorant or wicked men had been advanced to ecclesiastical dignities, they

[1] De Episcopis quoque ac Pastoribus eligendis, æquum imprimis esse, ut quæ jure canonico caventur, ea sarta tecta maneant, neque novi quid, abrogatis veteribus, ullo modo subrogetur, id quoque prudenter adjecerunt, cum Prælatorum electio in Regia potestate, suffragante summo Pontifice, esset, de ea in tenella Reginæ ætate, contra quicquam statui, sine aperta temeritatis nota, ac Regiæ potestatis imminutione, nullo modo posse. Lesly, 504.

[2] Hoc etiam amplius, ad eam partem, quæ erat de Ministrorum electione; in hoc genere quæstionum, aut juris Canonici, aut Concilii Tridentini decretis standum. Buchanan, 587.

might be removed, and others substituted in their offices."[1] In which words, it is plain, that as there had been "HONORES" —"*ecclesiastical dignities*," and "MINISTERIA"—"*different offices*," amongst the clergy before, so now there was nothing like petitioning for *abrogating* any of them, but that these *dignities* might be better bestowed, and these *offices* better provided. The *dignities* and *offices* were to continue; no change to be made but of the *dignitaries* and *officers*. Second, as for Spottiswoode, as I grant it had been very proper for his purpose to have taken notice of the "Article" as it is in Lesly; so, that he took no notice of it, is no argument that Lesly was in the wrong; for, besides that there is no colour of reason for discrediting one historian's accounts, because another is silent about them, the truth is, whosoever reads Spottiswoode's History, and compares it with the rest of our histories, will find a very great many such defects. And we shall have a very clear as well as a very considerable instance by and by, when we come to the next Petition. In the meantime, let me add another irrefragable evidence, so I think, of Lesly's integrity as to this Article.

6. It is, that when our Reformers had carried the day, and so came to establish the government of the Church, they exactly *reduced* to *practice* that which they had *petitioned* for in the Article, in the election of Superintendents, as is clear both from the "First Book of Discipline," and the "Form of Electing Superintendents," as it is to be seen both in the old Scottish Liturgy and in Knox's History.

In the "Fifth Head" of the "First Book of Discipline," it was appointed[2] that "the Council should nominate the *Superintendents*, or give commission to men of best knowledge, and who had the fear of God, to do it—the gentlemen and burgesses of towns within the Dioceses being always made privy to the election." And in the "Order" for "Electing Superintendents," as it is both in the old Liturgy and Knox's History,[3] we are told that "the Council having given charge and power to the churches of Lothian to choose

[1] Si per superiorum temporum negligentiam, indocti flagitiosive ad honores obrepsissent, ut iis a Ministeriis Ecclesiæ remotis, alii sufficerentur. Buchanan, 586.

[2] Spottiswoode, 159. [3] Knox, 289.

Master John Spottiswoode, Superintendent, sufficient warning was made by public edict to the churches of Edinburgh, Linlithgow, Stirling, Tranent, Haddington, and Dunbar, as also to Earls, Lords, Barons, gentlemen, or others that had, or might claim to have, voice in the election, to be present," &c. This was done in the beginning of the year 1561. Now, lay these two things together, and what is the result? What else than *giving power to the Nobility and Gentry of the Diocese to elect their Bishop according to the Article*, as Lesly hath it in his breviate of the Petition? Thus we have found Lesly honest, and his account just and genuine; and thereby, as I take it, this proposition fairly demonstrated—that our Reformers were so far from being Presbyterian—so far from being for the *Divine institution* and *indispensible right* of *parity*, that, on the contrary, they were clear for *imparity*—for *Episcopacy*. But this is not all. The second Petition which I mentioned, and which is set down in full form in Knox's History, though it doth not name *Bishops*, is every whit as *plain* and *decretory*, that the sentiments of our Reformers were no ways *inimicous* to Prelacy (if I may make use of a word made *fashionable* by a Nobleman of the *fashion*), but, on the contrary, that they were plainly for it. This I take to be so fully and fairly expressed in the fifth and last Article of that Petition, that I will here transcribe it word for word:—[1]

"Lastly, we require most humbly that the wicked, slanderous, and detestable life of Prelates, and of the State Ecclesiastical, may be reformed, that the people by them have not occasion (as of many days *they have had*) to contemn their ministry, and the preaching whereof they should be messengers. And if they suspect that we rather envy their honours, or covet their riches and possessions, than zealously desire their amendment and salvation, we are content that not only the rules and precepts of the New Testament, but also THE WRITINGS of the ANCIENT FATHERS, and the GODLY and APPROVED LAWS of JUSTINIAN the EMPEROR, decide the controversy betwixt us and them. And if it shall be found, that either malevolently or ignorantly, we ask more than these forenamed have required, and continually

[1] Knox, 131.

do require, of able and true ministers in Christ's Church, we refuse not correction, as your Majesty, with right judgment, shall think meet; but if all the forenamed shall condemn that which we condemn, and approve that which we require, then we most earnestly beseech your Majesty, that notwithstanding the long custom which they have had to live at their lust, they be compelled either to desist from ecclesiastical administration, or to discharge their duties as becometh true ministers, so that the GRAVE and GODLY FACE of the PRIMITIVE CHURCH being REDUCED, ignorance may be expelled, true doctrine and good manners may once again appear in the Church of this realm."

Here our Reformers lay down a *complex Rule*, according to which they crave the Church and the Ecclesiastical State may be reformed. This *complex Rule* is made up of the *rules* and *precepts* of the New Testament, the writings of the ancient Fathers, and the "godly and approved laws" of the Emperor Justinian. This is that *solid*, *orthodox*, *proper*, and *adequate Rule* of Reformation, which I mentioned before, as Vincentius Lirinensis's *Rule*, and the *Rule* wherein our Reformers agreed with the English Reformers. By this *Rule* our Reformers are content that all the controversies betwixt them and the Papists be decided—they refuse not correction if they ask more than this *Rule requires*—they condemn no more than this *Rule condemns*. This *Rule approves all* they are asking. In short, they require no more than that according to *this Rule* the *grave* and *godly face* of the Primitive Church may be restored as it was in Justinian's time. Let the Ecclesiastical State be reduced to that *frame* and *constitution*, and the clergy *live*, and *rule*, and *discharge* their trusts and offices as the clergy did *then*, and they are satisfied. And now, if these Reformers who thus petitioned, and in their Petition thus reasoned and agreed to such a *Rule* of Reformation, were for the *Divine institution* of *parity* and the *sacred rights* of *Presbytery*—nay, if they were not not only for the *lawfulness* but the *continuance* of *Prelacy*—I must confess my ignorance to be very gross, and so I refuse not correction.

For this evidence, as I said, we are beholden to Knox, and to Knox only. It is true, indeed, Calderwood[1] gives us

[1] Calderwood, 5.

the abstract of this Petition, but he conceals and suppresses the whole pith and marrow of this Article, summing it up in these few ill-complexioned words—"That the slanderous and detestable life of the Prelates, and the State Ecclesiastical may be reformed;" which at first view one would imagine looked *kindly* towards *Presbytery*, but I am not surprized to find him thus at his *tricks*—it is but according to his custom. To have set down the *full* Article, or to have abridged it so as that its *force* and *purpose* might have been seen, had been to disserve his cause, and do an ill office to his idol—*Parity*. And Petrie, as I have said, was so *wise* as not to *touch* it at all, lest it had *burnt* his *fingers;* but that Archbishop Spottiswoode should have overlooked it both in his History and in his "Refutatio Libelli," &c. seems very strange. For my part, I should rather think we have not his History entire,[1] and as he designed it for the press (for which I have heard other very pregnant presumptions) than that so great a man was guilty of so great an *oscitancy*. But whatever be of this, Knox has it, and that is enough, and Calderwood has abridged it, and that is more than enough for my Presbyterian brethren.

The third Petition which I promised to adduce, is *that* which was presented to the Parliament which established the Reformation, anno 1560, for which we are obliged to Knox alone also, at least so far as the present argument is concerned.[2] For though both Spottiswoode and Petrie[3] make

[1] [The following extract from the writings of an avowed enemy, confirms this opinion—"I have not indeed compared Mr. Bailey's (Principal Baillie of Glasgow) citations from Spottiswoode with the print, and I wish you may do it with your copy. I noticed Bishop Burnet, in his three volumes of the History of the Reformation, observing Spottiswoode's History castrate in some passages, and I am wonderfully pleased to hear you have a copy collated with two manuscripts, and the differences in the margin. I have Gordon of Straloch's remarks on Spottiswoode, and the late Bishop of Carlisle, now of Derry, told me he had the copy of Spottiswoode's History, as designed for the press—(this is most probably the manuscript now in Trinity College Library, Dublin, which has the Archbishop's own *imprimatur* at the end)—and he had noticed no small alterations in it." Wodrow to Dr James Fraser, February 26, 1722. Analecta Scotica, First Series, p. 308. The desideratum of a correct edition of Spottiswoode's History, will soon be supplied by the Spottiswoode Society, who hope to obtain the services of an eminent Prelate of the Church in Scotland, in presenting a correct and authentic edition of this important work to their subscribers—E.] [2] Knox, 261. [3] Spottiswoode, 150; Petrie, 219.

mention of the Petition or Supplication, yet neither of them has recorded that which I take notice of; and Calderwood is so accurate an historian as to take no notice of the Petition. That which I take notice of in it, as it is in Knox, is, that, when our Reformers came to crave the Reformation of the Ecclesiastical State, they bespoke the Parliament thus—"And lest that your Honours should doubt in any of the premises"—(they had affirmed before that the doctrine of the Roman Church contained many pestiferous errors—that the Sacraments of Jesus Christ were most shamefully abused and profaned by the Roman harlot—that the true discipline of the ancient Church amongst that sect was utterly extinguished—and that the clergy, of all men within the realm, were most corrupt in life and manners, &c.)—"we offer ourselves evidently to prove, that in all the rabble of the clergy there is not one lawful minister, IF GOD'S WORD, THE PRACTICES OF THE APOSTLES, THE SINCERITY OF THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH, AND THEIR OWN ANCIENT LAWS, SHALL JUDGE OF THE ELECTION." Here, I say, our Reformers insist on that same very rule, for finding if there be corruptions in, and by consequence for reforming of, the Church, on which they insisted in the aforementioned Petition, from which it is evident they persisted of the same sentiments, and it is easy to draw the same inferences.

Such were the sentiments of our Scottish Reformers before the Reformed religion had the countenance of the Civil Government and Acts of Parliament on its side, and was made the National religion. Let us try next what kind of government they did establish when they had got law for them—whether they established a government that was to be managed by ministers acting in *parity* or in *imparity?* And here, I think, the controversy might very soon be brought to a very fair issue. The "First Book of Discipline," the Acts of many General Assemblies, the Acts of many Parliaments, both without interruption, the unanimous consent of historians, and the uncontroverted practice of the Church for many years, all concurring to this assertion—that the first establishment was of a government, which was to be managed by Superintendents, and parochial ministers, elders, and deacons, acting in *subordination*, not in a *state* of *parity* with, but in a *state* of *inferiority* in

power and jurisdiction to, these Superintendents. This establishment, I say, is so clear and undoubted, from all these fountains, that no more needed be said upon the whole argument. But because our Presbyterian historians and antiquaries, though they cannot *deny* the thing, do yet endeavour, with all their *might* and *cunning*, to *intricate* it and *obscure* it, I shall further undertake two things.

I. I shall give the world a fair prospect of the power of Superintendents, as they were then established, and of the disparities betwixt them and parish ministers.

II. I shall endeavour to dissipate these mists whereby our Presbyterian brethren are so very earnest to involve and darken this matter.

I. As for the First, the world may competently see that Superintendents, as established in Scotland at the Reformation, had a considerable *stock* of prerogatives or pre-eminences, call them as you will, which raised them far above other Churchmen—far above the allowances of that *parity* our Presbyterian brethren contend for so eagerly, from the following enumeration.

1. They had *Districts* or *Dioceses* of far larger extent than other Churchmen. Private ministers had only their private parishes, and might have been as many as there were churches in the kingdom; but according to the scheme laid down by our Reformers in the "First Book of Discipline," Head 5,[1] only ten or twelve Superintendents were designed to have the *chief care*, as it is worded in the prayer at the admission of a Superintendent, of all the churches within the Kingdom. Indeed, ten are only there designed, but it was because of the scarcity of qualified men, as we shall learn hereafter.

2. As they had larger *Districts* than parish ministers, so there were correspondent *specialities* in their election. Parish ministers were to enter to such churches as had benefices, by *presentation* from the *patron*, and *collation* from the *Superintendent*, as is evident from Act 7, Parl. 1,[2] James VI., and many Acts of Assemblies, as shall be fully proven afterward. If they were to serve where the benefice was actually possessed by a *Papist*, they were to be *chosen*

[1] Spottiswoode, 158. [2] [Acta Parl. Scot. Fol. Ed. vol. iii. p. 23.—E.]

by the *people* of the congregation, by the appointment of the "First Book of Discipline," Head 4.[1] But the *election* of *Superintendents* was quite different. They were to be *nominated* by the *Council*, and *elected* by the *Nobility and gentry*, &c., within their *Dioceses*, as hath been already considered.

3. There was as great a difference in the matter of *deposition*, if they deserved it. Parish ministers, by the "First Book of Discipline," Head 8,[2] were *deposable* by the *Superintendent* of the *Diocese*, and the elders of the parishes, where they were ministers; but of this more hereafter.[3] But by that same "First Book of Discipline" the Superintendent was to be "judged by the ministers and elders of his whole province over which he was appointed; and if the ministers and elders of the province were negligent in correcting him, one or two other Superintendents, with their ministers and elders, were to convene him, providing it were within his own province or chief town, and inflict the censure which his offence deserved." Of the reasonableness of this afterward.

4. There was as remarkable a difference in point of *ordination*, which in the then Scottish style was called *admission*. Private ministers were to be admitted by their Superintendents, as we shall find afterwards. But by the "First Book of Discipline," Head 5,[4] Superintendents were to be admitted by the Superintendents next adjacent, with the ministers of the province.

5. In the case of *translation*, the General Assembly, holden at Edinburgh, December 25, 1562, gives "power to every Superintendent within his own bounds, in his Synodal Assembly, with consent of the most part of the elders and ministers of kirks, to translate ministers from one kirk to another, as they shall consider the necessity; charging the minister so translated to obey the voice and commandment of the Superintendent."[5] But according to the "First Book of Discipline," Head 5[6]—"No Superintendent might be translated at the pleasure or request of any one province without the council of the whole Church, and that for grave causes and considerations."

[1] Spottiswoode, 154. [2] Ibid. 168. [3] Ibid. 160.
[4] Ibid. 159. [5] MSS. Petrie, 233. [6] Spottiswoode, 160.

6. A special care was to be taken of his *qualifications* and *abilities* for such an important office, for thus it is appointed by the "First Book of Discipline," Head 5,[1] that—"after the Church shall be established, and three years are past, no man shall be called to the office of a Superintendent who hath not two years at least given a proof of his faithful labours in the ministry"—a *caution* simply unapplicable to *parish* ministers.

7. He had a *living* provided for him by the "First Book of Discipline," Head 5,[2] about *five* times as much yearly as was allotted for any *private minister*; and it is to be observed that this was in a time when the Popish Bishops still brooked their benefices; but when the resolution was, anno 1567, to deprive all the Popish clergy, it was agreed to in the General Assembly by the Churchmen on the one hand, and the Lords and Barons on the other, that Superintendents should succeed in their places, as both the MSS. and Spottiswoode have it expressly.[3]

8. Superintendents, by virtue of their office, were *constant members* of the General Assemblies; therefore the General Assembly holden at Perth, June 25, 1563, statuted—"That every Superintendent be present the first day of the Assembly under the pain of forty shillings, to be given to the poor without remission." So it is in the MSS.; but Petrie has it barely—"That they shall convene on the first day of every Assembly."[4] And, it seems, because that punishment had not sufficient influence on them, it was again ordained by the General Assembly, at Edinburgh, March 6, 1573, that "they shall be present in the Assembly the first day before noon, under the pain of losing one half of their stipend for a year," &c. So both the MSS. and Petrie.[5] But, as we shall find afterwards, such *presence* of parish ministers was not *allowed*, far less *necessary*.

9. It belonged to them to *try* those who stood *candidates* for the ministry. Thus, "First Book of Discipline," Head 4[6]—"Such as take upon them the office of preachers, who shall not be found qualified therefore by the Superintendent, are by him to be placed readers." And again, Head 5[7]—"No

[1] Spottiswoode, 160. [2] Ibid. 157. [3] Ibid. 210. Art. 11. [4] Petrie, 237.
[5] Ibid. 379. [6] Spottiswoode, 157. [7] Ibid. 158.

child, nor person within the age of twenty-one years, may be admitted to the office of a reader; but such must be chosen and admitted by the Superintendent as for their gravity and discretion may grace the function that they are called unto." And the Assembly at Edinburgh, December 25, 1562, ordains—"That inhibition be made against all such ministers as have not been presented by the people, or a part thereof, to the Superintendent, and he, after examination and trial, has not appointed them to their charges." So the MSS., and so Petrie.[1] And Spottiswoode cites another Act of the General Assembly at Edinburgh, 1564, to the same purpose.[2]

10. As appears by that Act of the Assembly, December 25, 1562, just now cited, and the 7th Act, Parliament 1, James VI., cited before, also Superintendents had the power of granting *collations* upon *presentations;* and the Assembly at Perth, holden in June 1563, appoints—"That when any benefice chances to vaik, or is now vacant, that a qualified person be presented to the Superintendent of that province where the benefice lieth, and that he being found sufficient, be admitted, &c." So I find it cited by the author of "Episcopacy not abjured in Scotland."[3]

11. A Superintendent had *power* to plant ministers in churches where the people were negligent to present timeously, and indeed that *power* devolved much sooner into his hands by the "First Book of Discipline," Head 4,[4] than it did afterwards into the hands of either *Bishop* or *Presbytery;* for there it is ordered—that "if the people be found negligent in electing a minister the space of forty days, the Superintendent with his council may present unto them a man whom they judge apt to feed the flock," &c.

12. And as he had thus the *power* of *trying* and *collating* ministers, and *planting* churches in the case of a *jus devolutum*, so he had the *power* of *ordination*,[5] which, as I said, was then called *admission*, as is evident from the "First Book

[1] Petrie, 233. [2] Spottiswoode, 190.

[3] [John Maxwell, Bishop of Ross in Scotland, afterwards Bishop of Killala, and Archbishop of Tuam, in Ireland.—E.]

[4] Spottiswoode, 154.

[5] [It must not be forgotten that this *power* was confined merely to a *public declaration* that the person was duly admitted to the pastoral charge of his parish or congregation, there being no such thing then as *the imposition of hands*. First Book of Discipline, Cap. IV.—E.]

of Discipline," cap. 5, and several Acts of Assemblies already cited.

13. All presbyters or parish ministers, once *admitted* to churches, were bound to pay *canonical obedience* to their Superintendents. Thus, in the Assembly at Edinburgh, June 30, 1562—"It was concluded by the whole ministers assembled, that all ministers should be subject to the Superintendents in all lawful admonitions, as is prescribed as well in the Book of Discipline as in the Election of Superintendents." So the MSS. And by that forecited Act of the Assembly at Edinburgh, December 25, 1562—"Ministers translated from one church to another are commanded to obey the voice and commandment of the Superintendent." Indeed, it was part of an Article presented by the Church to the Council, May 27, 1561, that "an Act should be made, appointing a (civil) punishment for such as disobeyed or contemned the Superintendents in their function."[1]

14. He had *power* to *visit* all the churches within his Diocese, "*and in that visitation*"—they are the words of the "First Book of Discipline," Head 5[2]—"to try the life, diligence, and behaviour of the ministers, the order of their churches, the manners of their people, how the poor are provided, and how the youth are instructed," &c. And further, in these visitations he had *power* particularly "to take account of what books every minister had, and how he profited from time to time by them." By Act of Assembly at Edinburgh, June 29, 1562. So it is in the MSS.

15. He had *power* to *depose* ministers that deserved it, as appears from the "First Book of Discipline," Head 8, already cited; and by the Assembly at Edinburgh, March 6, 1573, it is statuted that—"if any minister reside not at the church where his charge is, he shall be summoned before his Superintendent, or commissioner of the province, to whom the Assembly gives power to depose him," &c. So the MSS. and Petrie.[3]

16. He had *power* to *translate* ministers from one church to another, as appears from the Act already cited, number 5; and by an Act of the Assembly at Edinburgh, June 25, 1564—"It is concluded that a minister, being once placed, may not leave that congregation without the knowledge

[1] Knox, 297; Petrie, 223. [2] Spottiswoode, 159. [3] Petrie, 378.

of the flock, and consent of the Superintendent or whole Church," i. e. a General Assembly. So the MSS., and so Petrie.[1] These are all *powers*, methinks, scarcely reconcileable with an opinion of the *Divine right* of *parity*, but there are more, and perhaps more considerable, as yet to follow.

17. For he had *power* to *nominate* ministers to be *members* of the General Assembly. This is clearly asserted by the Acts of two General Assemblies; the first at Edinburgh in June 1562, where it was ordained—"That no minister leave his flock for coming to the Assembly except he have complaints to make, or be complained of, or at least be warned thereto by the Superintendent." So it is in the MSS., and Spottiswoode cites it in his "Refutatio Libelli,"[2] &c. The other Act was made by the Assembly holden at Edinburgh, July 1, 1563, which I find thus worded in the MSS. fairly agreeing with Spottiswoode[3]—"Anent the Order hereafter to be used in General Assemblies, they all voted and concluded as followeth, viz. that if the Order already received pleases not, by reason of the plurality of voices, it be reformed in this manner. First, That none have place to vote except Superintendents, commissioners appointed for visiting the kirks, and ministers brought with them, presented as persons able to reason, and having knowledge to judge; with the aforenamed shall be joined commissioners of burghs and shires, together with commissioners of Universities. Secondly, ministers and commissioners shall be chosen at the Synodal Convention of the Diocese, by consent of the rest of the ministers and gentlemen that shall convene at the said Synodal Convention," &c. From which it is plain, that the *Superintendent* or *Commissioner*, who was a temporary Superintendent, *nominated* the ministers they brought with them to the Assembly, and that the *rest* of the ministers, &c. had only a *power* of *consenting*; and so it was thereafter practised unquestionably. And if there were need of more *light*, it might be copiously received from the Lord Glammis' letter to Mr Beza, anno 1576, wherein he tells him that it had been the custom, ever since the Reformation, that the Superintendents or Bishops still nominated the

[1] Petrie, 340.

[2] [See Spottiswoode Miscellany, vol. i. printed for the Spottiswoode Society.—E.]

[3] Spottiswoode, 219.

ministers who met in the General Assemblies ;[1] than which nothing can be more distinct and plain. And this testimony is the more considerable, that it was not Glammis' own *private deed*, but that which was the *result* of a considerable *consult*, as we shall learn hereafter.

This was such a branch of Episcopal power as mightily offended our Presbyterian historians, it seems, for they have endeavoured to *obscure* it as much as they could. Neither Calderwood nor Petrie mentions the first of these two Acts. They mention the second, indeed, but how? Calderwood[2] huddles it up thus — "It was thought meet for eschewing of confusion that this Order be followed, that none have place nor power to vote, except Superintendents, commissioners appointed for visiting of kirks, ministers, commissioners of burghs and shires, together with the commissioners of Universities. Ministers and commissioners of shires shall be chosen at the Synodal Convention of the Dioceses, with consent of the rest of the ministers and gentlemen," &c. Leaving out entirely these words, "*brought with them*" (i. e. with the Superintendents and commissioners of kirks,) "*presented as persons able to reason, and having knowledge to judge*,"—whereby the *power* of the Superintendents and commissioners for visiting of kirks is quite *stifled*, and the whole *sense* of the Act perverted; for what sense is it, I pray, to say that the ministers were to be chosen by *consent* of the *rest* of the ministers, when you tell not *who* was to *choose*, or who they were, to whose *choice* or *nomination* the *rest* of the ministers were to give *that consent?* But it is no strange thing with this author to let *sense* shift for itself, if the *good cause* cannot be otherwise served. Neither is Petrie less unfaithful, for he not only draws the curtain over the whole *power* of the Superintendent, &c., so that you cannot have the least glimpse of it from his account, but he intermixes *lies* to boot; only he *stumbles* not on *nonsense*. He accounts thus[3]—"Because

[1] Post Reformatam religionem consuetudine receptum est, ut Episcopi, et ex ministris pastoribus ac senioribus, tot quot iidem Episcopi jusserint, unum in locum conveniant, cum præcipuis Baronibus ac Nobilibus, religionem veram profitentibus, et de doctrina et de moribus inquisituri.

[2] Calderwood, 45. [3] Petrie, 359.

heretofore all ministers that would come were admitted to vote"—(Not one word of this in the narrative of the Act as it is in the MSS., or any other historian; and it is directly contrary to the Act 1562, already mentioned, so that it is plain it is a figment of his own.)—"And now the number is increased, and commissioners of shires were chosen in the Sheriff Court"—(no other historian or record I have seen, has one syllable of this either, though it is probable enough it was so),—"this Assembly makes an Act of three parts, concerning the admission of members. 1. That none shall have place to vote but Superintendents, commissioners for visiting churches, ministers and commissioners of shires and burghs, chosen as follows, together with commissioners of Universities. 2. Ministers and commissioners of shires shall be chosen at the Synod of the bounds by the ministers and gentlemen convening there," &c. Not—"with the consent of the rest of the ministers," &c., you see, as Calderwood ridiculously had it, but "chosen by the ministers," &c., without the least syllable that might import the Superintendents having *any* (and far less the *principal*) *power* in that election. This is clean work of it. Thus, I say, these two historians of the *party* treat this notable *branch* of the *power* which our Reformers thought reasonable to confer on Superintendents; but we shall not want occasions enough for *admiring* their *ingenuity*. Return we now to our task.

18. They had *power* to hold Diocesan Synods. "Ordains further"—they are the words of an Act of the Assembly holden in December 1562, as it is both in the MSS. and Petrie[1]—"that the Superintendents appoint Synodal Conventions twice in the year, viz. in the months of April and October, on such days of the said months as the Superintendents shall think good." Whereby two things appear, 1. That he had the sole appointment of the day of meeting; 2. That he alone was preses of the meeting. Indeed, they are frequently, or rather constantly, called *his* Synods.

19. Superintendents had *power* within their own bounds to appoint *Diocesan fasts*, granted to them by an Act of the Assembly holden at Edinburgh, March 5, 1570. For there it is enacted "that all Superintendents and commissioners

[1] Petrie, 233.

to plant kirks in their first Synodal Conventions hereafter following, with the advice of their ministers, shall reason and appoint *public fasting*, if it shall be thought necessary." So the MSS. and Petrie.[1]

20. Another considerable instance of the *power* of Superintendents, was that of *modifying* or *assigning* to parish ministers their stipends or livings. This is clear from an Act of the General Assembly, holden at Edinburgh on the 7th of July 1569, as it is both in the MSS. and Petrie,[2] wherein " the Kirk presently convened found it most needful and expedient that all Superintendents, ministers, exhorters, and readers should have their own particular assignations"—out of the thirds of benefices, as shall be more fully discoursed hereafter—" appointed them to be received from the hands of the labourers *respective*, or others addebted in payment of the thirds. And, therefore, the Kirk in one voice, by this their Act, gave their full power and commission to every Superintendent and commissioner within their own bounds, with advice and consent of their Synodal Conventions, to give to every minister, exhorter, and reader, particular assignations *ad vitam*, as they should find the same expedient, under the Superintendent's subscription, and ministers aforesaid, with all clauses needful and expedient thereto, which shall be as sufficient as if the same were sped by the General Assembly of the Kirk; and as concerning the Superintendents and commissioners of kirks, their provision and assignation to be made by the General Assembly."

21. Appeals were to be made to *them* from *inferior judicatories*. Thus, by the Assembly at Perth, in June 1563[3]— " Concerning the order of appellation, it is statuted and ordained, that if any person find himself hurt by any sentence given by any minister, elders, or deacons"—i. e. by any kirk-session, as we call them—" it shall be lawful for the person so hurt to appeal to the Superintendent of the Diocese and his Synodal Convention within ten days next after; and the said Superintendent shall take cognition whether it was well appealed or not, and give his sentence thereupon." It is true, indeed, (and it was reasonable), by the same Act, the

[1] Petrie, 369. [2] Ibid. 365. [3] MSS. Petrie, 237; Calderwood, 33.

person if he thought himself injured by the Superintendent's sentence might *appeal* to the General Assembly.

Nay, 22. If the Superintendent found it *male appellatum*, he had power of *fining*. Thus it is ordered by the same Assembly—"If the appellant justifies not his appellation before the Superintendent and his convention aforesaid; then the Superintendent shall impute a pain upon the said appellant as he shall think good, beside the expense of the party." That he had this *power* is all I am concerned for; let others judge whether it was *purely ecclesiastical*.

23. And as the Superintendent had this *power* of receiving appeals made from inferior courts, so agreeably, he had the *power*, with the advice of his Synod, or such of the ministers of his Diocese as *he* should *choose* for that purpose—"to determine intricate cases of conscience or government." Thus, by the Assembly at Edinburgh, December 25, 1564,[1] "It is ordained, that no questions be proponed by any brother till the affairs of the Kirk, and the order thereof, be first treated and ended; and thereafter if any brother have a question worthy to be proponed, that the same be presented in writ, and if the same requires hasty resolution, it shall be decided in the present Assembly before the end thereof; otherwise the decision of the same shall be referred to every one of the Superintendents within whose bounds the question is proponed; and they, and every one of them, with a certain number of ministers, as they shall think meet to appoint for assisting, shall hear the reasonings of the aforesaid questions, and thereafter present the reasons in writ, *affirmativè* or *negativè*, which every one of them shall report to the next Assembly." Again, by the Assembly holden at Edinburgh, in July 1568[2]—"It is statuted and ordained that ministers, exhorters, readers, or other persons hereafter, trouble not nor molest the General Assembly with such things as Superintendents may, and ought to *decide* in their Synodal Conventions; and if any chance to do hereafter in the contrary, their letters shall be rejected." Which Act, as is obvious, extends both to cases of *right* and of *fact;* and extending to cases of *fact*, it clears a little further the former head of appeals, intimating fairly that

[1] MSS. Petrie, 341. [2] MSS. Petrie, 360; Spottiswoode, 219.

they were not to be made *per saltum*, neither yet *delations*, but both in their proper *gradation* were to be brought first before the *Superintendent*, and by *him* only, if he thought it needful, to be *advanced* before the General Assembly. But most *home* to the present point is the Act of the Assembly, March 5, 1571,[1] by which it is statuted—"That all questions be first proponed to Superintendents, or commissioners, in their Synodal Conventions, and there receive solution, and if they think them too hard, that they bring them to the General Assembly; but that no private ministers bring questions to the Assembly *prima instantia*."

24. It belonged to the Superintendents particularly to judge of *divorces*,[2] a point of great *intricacy* as well as *importance*. Thus, I find the Assembly at Edinburgh, December 25, 1562, as it is in the MSS., ordains—"That no ministers, nor others bearing office in the Kirk, take in hand to cognosce or decide in the actions of divorcement, except the Superintendents, and they to whom they shall give special commission."

25. It was a *branch* of their *power* also to *enjoin penance* to *greater criminals*. So the General Assembly holden at Edinburgh, June 25, 1564, as it is in the MSS., where it is thus—"Touching such as relapse the third time in any kind of crime, such as fornication or drunkenness, it is statuted and ordained that no particular minister admit such persons to repentance, but that they send them to the *Superintendent*

[1] MSS. Petrie, 369.

[2] [No persons were louder than the Scottish Reformers, in their denunciations against the Prelates of the Ante-Reformation Church, for holding offices unsuitable to their sacred functions. Yet, when the Superintendents attempted to occupy their vacant places, we find *them* assuming those very powers which they deemed it so sinful for their predecessors to hold. Singular inconsistency! The details of examinations and proceedings in cases of an *immoral* nature, which are given in the "Book of the Universall Kirk," are most extraordinary, and one cannot help wondering that persons of such godly pretensions should have gone out of their way to come in contact with indecency, and should have discussed questions of the most abandoned vice, with more than necessary plainness and coarseness. The theological work of Peter Dens has been most severely reprobated for the indelicacy of some of its questions, but it is very problematical whether the worst of them approximate to some of the *discussions*, which are recorded as having taken place in the General Assemblies, Synods, and solemn meetings of the Scottish Reformers.—E.]

of the Diocese where the crimes are committed, with information, who shall give them such injunctions as they think may make the offence to be holden in horror; but chiefly that they compel the offender to satisfy where the offences were made more days than one, as the Superintendent shall think good." And by the General Assembly at Edinburgh, March 5, 1571[1]—"It is ordained that adulterers, and other such scandalous persons, shall hereafter be called by the Superintendent, or commissioner of the province, to compear before their Synodal Convention, and there receive their injunctions." And accordingly we find the custom of the Church in those times, particularly in the case of the Countess of Argyll, anno 1567. She had been guilty of a mighty scandal, in being present at the *christening* of the Prince (afterwards James VI.), which was performed after the Popish manner. She behoved, therefore, to give satisfaction to the Church, and was ordered to do it by the General Assembly, in such manner and at such time as the Superintendent of Lothian, within whose bounds the scandal was committed, should appoint. So both Spottiswoode and Petrie.[2]

26. Another *branch* was to *restore criminals* to the exercises of their offices, if they had any dependance on the Church, after they had performed their *penance* and received *absolution*. Thus, Thomas Duncanson, reader at Stirling, had fallen in the sin of fornication; for this he was silenced. He had performed his *penance*, and was *absolved*. Then the question was put to the General Assembly, met at Edinburgh, December 25, 1563—"Whether, having made public repentance, he might be *restored* to his *office?*"—And the General Assembly determined—"He might not, till the church of Stirling should make request to the Superintendent for him."[3]

27. To the Superintendents was reserved the *power of excommunication* in cases of contumacy, &c. Thus, it is statuted by the General Assembly at Edinburgh, July 1, 1562—"That in cases of contumacy the minister give notice to the Superintendent, with whose advice excommunication is to be pronounced." So the MSS., and both the MSS. and Petrie

[1] MSS. Petrie, 369. [2] Spottiswoode, 214; Petrie, 359.
[3] MSS. Petrie, 242.

have another long Act of the Assembly holden at Edinburgh, September 25, 1565, to the same purpose.[1]

28. It belonged also to them to delate *atrocious criminals* to the *civil* magistrate, that condign corporal punishments might be inflicted on them. To this purpose I find it enacted by a *Convention of the Kirk*, as it is called in the MSS., met at Edinburgh, December 15, 1567, to wait on the motions of the Parliament—"That ministers, elders, and deacons, make search within their bounds if the crimes of incest or adultery were committed, and to signify the same to the Superintendent, that he may notify it to the civil magistrate." Such was the power of Superintendents in the government of the Church and her discipline. But because several things may have relation to the Church, though not *formally* and *directly*, yet *reductively*, and by way of *analogical subordination*, their *power* extended even to *these* things also. I shall only instance in two.

29. Then, because Universities, Colleges, and Schools, are the *seminaries* of *learning*, and by consequence *nurseries* for the *ministry*, the *power* of Superintendents over them was very considerable. Thus, by the "First Book of Discipline," Head 5,[2] if, *e. g.* the Principal or Head of any College within the University of St Andrews died, the members of the College, being sworn to follow their consciences, were to nominate three of the most sufficient men within the University. This done, the Superintendent of Fife, by himself, or his special *procurators*, with the *Rector* and the *rest* of the *Principals*, were to *choose* one of these three, and constitute him Principal. And when the Rector was chosen, he was to be *confirmed* by the Superintendent,[3] by that same Book. And again, by that same Book,[4] the *money* collected in every College for upholding the fabrick was to be counted and employed at the sight of the Superintendent. Further, the General Assembly convened at Edinburgh, January 25, 1565, presented this Article in a Petition to the Queen—"That none might be permitted to have charge of Schools, Colleges, and Universities, &c. but such as should be tried by the Superintendents." So it is in the MSS. It is true, it was not granted

[1] Petrie, 346. [2] Spottiswoode, 162. [3] Ibid. 163. [4] Ibid.

at that time, but it shews the inclinations of our Reformers as much as if it had been granted. And because it was not granted then, it was proposed again in the Assembly in July 1567, and consented to by the Nobility and gentry, and ratified by the eleventh Act of the first Parliament[1] of James VI. in December that same year. And accordingly we find the Laird of Dun, Superintendent of Angus and Mearns in July 1568, holding a visitation of the University of Aberdeen, and by formal sentence turning out all the *Popish* members. The very *air* and *stile* of the sentence, as Petrie hath it,[2] is a notable evidence of the paramount *power* of Superintendents, for thus it runs—"I, John Erskine, Superintendent of Angus and Mearns, having commission of the Church to visit the Sheriffdoms of Aberdeen and Banff, by the advice, counsel, and consent of the ministers, elders, and commissioners of the Church present, decern, conclude, and for final sentence pronounce, that Master Alexander Anderson," &c.

30. Because *bad principles* may be *disseminated* by *bad books*, and thereby both the *purity* and *peace* of the Church may be endangered, the revising and licensing of the books was committed to the care of the Superintendents," by the General Assembly holden in June 1563, whereby it is ordained, that "no work be set forth in print, neither yet published in writ, touching religion or doctrine, until such time as each shall be presented to the Superintendent of the Diocese, and addressed and approven by him, or by such as he shall call, of the most learned within his bounds," &c.[3]

Thus I have collected no fewer that *thirty disparities* betwixt *Superintendents*, as they were established in Scotland by our Reformers, and *private parish ministers*; each of them a demonstration of inequality either of *power* or *figure*. Perchance a more *nice* and *accurate* inquirer may find out more, but methinks these may be sufficient for my purpose, which was to give the world a fair prospect of the *pre-eminence* of Superintendents, and of the differences betwixt them and other Churchmen. And having thus performed the first part of my undertaking, it is obvious to all who can pretend to be of the thinking part of mankind, that the

[1] [Acta Parl. Scot. fol. ed. vol. iii. p. 24.—E.] [2] Petrie, 362.
[3] MSS. Petrie, 237.

second Part is needless. For if these thirty disparities amount not to an invincible proof that our Church at the Reformation was not governed by ministers acting in *parity*, I may justly despair of ever proving any thing. Yet, because I know many simple and less thinking people are imposed on by the *noise* and *dust* our Presbyterian brethren have raised about this matter, I shall proceed to the next thing I undertook, which was

II. To dissipate these *mists* wherewith our *Parity-men* are so very earnest to involve and darken this *Prelatical power* of Superintendents. They may be reduced to these three;

1. The establishment of Superintendents was only *temporary*, and for the *then* necessities of the Church; Superintendency was not intended to be a perpetual standing office.

2. It was not the *same* with *Episcopacy*.

3. It was never established by Act of Parliament.

I. It is pleaded that Superintendency was only designed to be a *temporary*, not a *perpetual standing office* in the Church. Thus, Calderwood,[1] speaking of the "First Book of Discipline"—"We may safely say," says he, "the whole was recommended to be perpetually observed, except some few things, as the office of Superintendents, whereunto they were forced, as they thought, by necessity," &c. And in his breviate of the "First Book of Discipline,"[2] he offers as a reason why it was so:—"They make a difference at this time among ministers, some to be Superintendents, some to be ordinary ministers; not because Superintendents were of Divine institution, as an order to be observed perpetually in the Kirk, but because they were forced only AT THIS TIME to make the difference, lest, if all ministers should be appointed to make continual residence in several places, when there was so great rarity of preachers, the greatest part of the realm should be destitute of the preaching of the Word." And G[ilbert] R[ule], in his "First Vindication of the Church of Scotland," printed at Edinburgh, 1691, in answer to the First of the Ten Questions, following Calderwood exactly—(as, indeed, he doth all alongst, and it seems he has never read another of our historians, so that

[1] Calderwood, 25. [2] Ibid. 26.

he had some reason to call him THE HISTORIAN, Ibid.)—delivers it thus:—"It is true the Protestant Church of Scotland did set up Superintendents, but this was truly (and declared so to be) from the force of necessity, and designed only for that present exigency of the Church," &c. And more pointedly in his "True Representation of Presbyterian Government," printed at Edinburgh, 1690, Proposition 18, where he lays it down as an undoubted truth—"That Superintendency was only established through necessity, when a qualified minister could scarcely be had in a province," &c. And Petrie seems to aim at the same way of reasoning.[1]

Now, 1. Supposing all this true, what ground have they gained by it? Do they not fairly acknowledge that the *Prelacy* of *Superintendents* was established at the Reformation? And is not that all I am concerned for? For the question is not whether *Superintendency* was designed to be *perpetual* or *temporary*, but whether it was a *Prelacy?* And if it was a *Prelacy*, the Church of Scotland was not *then* governed by ministers *acting* in *parity*. The *perpetuity* or *temporariness* of it doth not affect its nature. If it was a *Prelacy* at all, it was as *really* a *Prelacy*, though it had lasted but for a day, as it had been though it had lasted till the day of judgment; just as our Presbyterian brethren were as *really* addressers to King James by addressing *once*, as they should have been though they had continued addressing to him till this very minute. This alone, in all conscience, might be enough for discussing this plea; yet, that I may not offend the party, by seeming to think so meanly of this mighty argument, I shall insist a little longer, and consider, 2. If they have any sufficient *fund*, in the records of these times, for this pretence. And, 3. What force or solidity is in the reason insisted on to make this pretence seem plausible. As to the first, viz. Whether there is any sufficient *fund*, in the records of these times, for this pretence, all I have observed insisted on for this, is only one phrase in the fifth Head of the First Book of Discipline—"AT THIS TIME." Take the whole period as it is in Petrie, for he censures Spottiswoode for curtailing it. As Petrie has it, it runs thus—"If the ministers whom God hath endued with

[1] Petrie, 218.

his singular graces among us should be appointed to several places, there to make their continual residence, the greatest part of the realm should be destitute of all doctrine; which should not only be the occasion of great murmur, but also dangerous to the salvation of many; and therefore we have thought it a thing expedient, AT THIS TIME, that from the whole number of godly and learned men, now presently in this realm, be selected *ten* or *twelve*, for in so many provinces we have divided the whole, to whom charge and commandment should be given to plant and erect kirks, to set, order, and appoint ministers to the countries that shall be appointed to their care, where none are now."[1] This is the whole foundation of the plea for the *temporariness* of *Superintendency;* but, if I mistake not, the true *gloss* of this period will amount to no more than this—that because there were then so few men qualified for the office of Superintendency, though ten or twelve were by far too small a number for the whole kingdom, yet at that time they thought it expedient to establish no more; and though, when the Church should be sufficiently provided with ministers, it would be highly reasonable that the Superintendents should have places appointed them for their continual residence, yet, in that juncture it was necessary that they should be constantly travelling through their districts to preach, and plant churches, &c. That the Period will bear this gloss is obvious to any who considers it impartially; and that *this*, and not the *Presbyterian*, is the *true* gloss, I hope may competently appear if these things be considered.

1. It is notorious that the compilers of that "First Book of Discipline" were generally, to their dying day, of *Prelatical principles.* They were *six*, as Knox tells us[2]:—Mr John Winram, who died Superintendent of Strathern; John Spottiswoode, who was many years a Superintendent, and a constant enemy to *Parity*,[3] as appears from his son's account

[1] Petrie, 218. [2] Knox, 283.

[3] [This is abundantly proved by his son, Archbishop Spottiswoode, who, in his "Refutatio Libelli," testifies to his father's opinions in the following plain terms—"Joannes Spottiswodus, Lothiana et Mercia Superintendens, ad ultimum vitæ annum, qui fuit 1585, dictitasse fertur, se talia utcumque laturum, ne si aliter faceret, suam dignitatem propugnare videretur, *audaculos tamen illos (ministros intelligi volebat)* nisi in ordinem cogerentur omnia

of him ;[1] John Willock, who died Superintendent of the West; John Douglas, who died Archbishop of St Andrews;[2] John Row, who was *one* of the *three* that defended the *lawfulness* of Episcopacy at the conference appointed by the General Assembly, 1575 ; and John Knox, of whom we have said enough already. Now, I ask, is it credible that these men, all so much for Prelacy all their lives, without any constraint on them, as it is certain there was none, should, while digesting a *model* of *policy*, have been only for a Prelacy that was to be laid aside within God knows how short a time, so soon as the parish churches could be planted with ministers? I know nothing can be said here, unless it be, that Knox was not so *prelatical* as the *rest*, and he would have it so, and the *rest* have yielded ; but there is no ground for this.

2. For even Knox himself, if he was the aûthor of the History which bears his name amongst our Presbyterian brethren, assigns a quite other reason than the *then necessities* of the Church for the establishment of Superintendency. " Superintendents and overseers were nominated," says he,[3] " that all things in the Church might be carried with order, and well :"—a reason which, as it *held* since the Apostles' times, will continue to *hold* so long as the Church continues. And is it not told again in that same History,[4] that at the *admission* of Spottiswoode to the Superintendency of Lothian, John Knox in his sermon asserted *the*

quandoque in Ecclesia turbaturos. Crebro etiam illud commemorabat; *fides nostra est veritati divinæ consentanea, sed politia veteris Ecclesiæ est nostra potior.*" He adds—" *Ejusdem sententiæ erant* Joannes Winramus, Fifæ Superintendens et Fani Andreæ Sub-prior, Georgius Hains plagæ Septentrionalis Commissionarius, vir summo ingenio et excellenti doctrina ; David Lindesius, qui postea Rossiæ Episcopus designatus est—ut de aliis multis taceam," &c. This David Lindesay, together with the above named George Hay and John Row, was nominated by the General Assembly in 1575 *to dispute in favour of Episcopacy* against the Genevan notion of Parity, which had then been broached for the first time in Scotland by Andrew Melville. *They supported the argument for Episcopacy against Melville himself, and two others selected for the purpose.* This fact speaks loudly as to the "*Prelatical*" *notions of the compilers of the First Book of Discipline*, since one of their number, when it began to be impugned, was chosen to defend the principles of Imparity, which it so manifestly established. Spottiswoode's Refutatio Libelli, p. 44 ; and Spottiswoode's History, p. 276.—E.]

[1] Spottiswoode, 344.

[2] [He was merely *Titular*.—E.]

[3] Knox, 260.

[4] Ibid. 289.

necessity of Superintendents, or overseers, as well as *ministers?* The *necessity,* I say, and not the *bare expediency* in that *juncture.* Further, now that I have Knox on the stage, I shall repeat over again a testimony of his, which I have once transcribed already, from his "Exhortation to England for the speedy embracing of Christ's Gospel." "Let no man be charged in preaching of Christ Jesus," says he,[1] "above that which a man may do. I mean that your Bishopries be so divided, that of every *one,* as they are now for the most part, may be made *ten;* and so in every city and great town there may be placed a godly learned man, with so many joined with him for preaching and instruction, as shall be thought sufficient for the bounds committed to their charge;"—than which testimony it is not possible to find a better comment upon that *Period* of the "First Book of Discipline," penned also by Knox himself, which is the subject of our present controversy, and it agrees exactly with *my gloss.* For, from this testimony, it is clear that he was for a great number of Bishops and *little Dioceses,* and that, in a Church sufficiently provided with ministers, the *Bishop* should not be obliged to *travel* from place to place for preaching, but might stay at the *chief city* or town of his *Diocese.* What I have said might be sufficient for preferring *mine* to the *Presbyterian gloss.* But I have more to say.

For, 3. This sense of the *Period* accords exactly with the whole tenor of the "First Book of Discipline," in which there is not another syllable the most partial reader can say favours the mistaken conceit about the *temporariness* of *Superintendency,* but much to the contrary.

Thus, in the Head of the *Election* of *Superintendents,*[2] the very first words are—"Such is the present necessity, that the examination and admission of Superintendents cannot be so strict as afterwards it must"—clearly importing that as *necessity* forced them to establish a *small* number at first, so also to take them as they could have them; but that a stricter accuracy in their trial would be needful when the number of qualified men should increase, which runs quite counter to the whole design of the Presbyterian gloss. Again—"If so many able men cannot be found at present

[1] P. 110. [2] Spottiswoode, 159.

as necessity requireth, it is better that these provinces wait till God provide, than that men unable to edify and govern the Church be suddenly placed in the charge,[1]" &c.—another demonstration why *at that time* they established so *few* Superintendents. Again—" If any Superintendent shall depart this life, or happen to be deposed,"[2] rules are laid down for supplying the vacancy; but to what purpose, if *Superintendency* was to be of so *short* continuance? Farther yet—"After the Church shall be established, and three years are past, no man shall be called to the office of a Superintendent who hath not, two years at least, given a proof of his faithful labours in the ministry of some church."[3] What could more plainly import that the *office* was to be *durable?* Once more: when this " Book of Discipline"[4] comes to the business of the Universities, it supposes that *Superintendents* and *Colleges* were to be of *equal continuance;* for the Superintendent was still to be at the choosing and instalment of Principals and Rectors, and the " moneys collected for upholding the fabrick" were to be counted yearly upon the 15th day of November, " in the presence of the Superintendent of the bounds," and employed with his advice, &c.

Neither is this all yet, for, 4. The *Form* and *Order* of the election of the Superintendent, to be found both in Knox's History[5] and the Old Scottish Liturgy, is every way as *patt* for the continuance of the office as the First Book of Discipline; for the first thing we meet with there, as I have already observed, is—" The necessity of ministers, and Superintendents, or Overseers," without any *exception* or *speciality* about the *one* more than the *other*. And as our Reformers had petitioned the Government for the establishment of a method to be observed in the election of Bishops and Presbyters, without any intimations of the *temporariness* of *either* office, as we have shewed before, so here we find it put in practice, as has likewise before been observed, without so much as one syllable favouring the *Presbyterian side* of the present controversy, but, on the contrary, all alongst for *mine*. Thus the people are asked—" If they will obey and honour him as Christ's minister, and comfort and assist him in every thing pertaining to his

[1] Spottiswoode, 159. [2] Ibid. 159. [3] Ibid. 160. [4] Ibid. 162, 163. [5] Knox, 289, &c.

charge?" And their answer is—"They will, and they promise him such obedience as becometh sheep to give unto their pastor"—*not so long as* the present necessity forceth, or the present exigence requireth, but—"so long as he remaineth faithful in his charge." In short, the *Order* or *Form* for *admitting* a *Superintendent* and a *parish minister* was all *one*, and there was nothing in it importing the *one* office to be *temporary* more than the *other*. And, however Calderwood thought fit to affirm, that "Superintendents were not then established as of Divine institution," yet in all this *Form* the Divine institution of their office is as much to be found as the Divine institution of ordinary ministers. The people, as we had it just now, were asked if they would obey him *as Christ's minister*. And he himself was asked—"If he knew that the excellency of this office, to the which GOD CALLED HIM, did require that his conversation should be irreprehensible?" And, again, it was asked the *people*—"Will ye not acknowledge this your brother, for the *minister* of *Christ Jesus*, your overseer and pastor? Will ye not maintain and comfort him in his ministry and watching over you, against all such as wickedly would rebel against God and HIS HOLY ORDINANCE?" And in the *prayer* after his *instalment* we have this petition—"Send unto this our brother, whom, IN THY NAME, we have charged with THE CHIEF CARE of thy Church within the bounds of Lothian," &c. Thus our Reformers thought of *Superintendency*, when they composed this *Form*. Now, if they looked upon it as *God's ordinance*, &c., with what reason can it be said they designed it *merely* to be *temporary*, and for *the then necessities of the Church?* I think it will be hard to prove that it was the *divinity* of these times, that men might *dispense* with *Divine institutions*. But of this more afterwards. In the meantime proceed we to a further and indeed an irrefragable topic for confirming my side of the present controversy.

And that is, 5. That as the "First Book of Discipline" and the "Form of admitting Superintendents" do both fairly import that our Reformers intended nothing less than the *temporariness* of *Superintendents*, so it is clear from a vast number of Acts of General Assemblies. Most of these Acts, I have already adduced for shewing the *disparities* between Superintendents and ordinary ministers, when they are

seriously considered will be found uncontrovertibly to this purpose. But there are many more; for example, consider these following—

The Assembly, May 27, 1561,[1] addressed to the Council—"That special and certain provision might be made for the maintenance of the Superintendents, ministers, exhorters, and readers; and that Superintendents and ministers might be planted where none were." The Assembly at Edinburgh, December 25, 1562, as the MSS. have it, enacted—"That notwithstanding the proponing and nominating of the Superintendents for *Aberdeen*, *Banff*, *Jedburgh*, and *Dumfries*, appointed before in the third Session, and the days appointed for the election of the same, the further advisement and nomination of the persons should be remitted to the Lords of the Secret Council; providing always that the days appointed for their election be not prolonged." Observe here, that *Aberdeen* and *Banff* were now designed *each* to have *their* Superintendent, whereas *both* were to be under *one* by the *first* nomination in the "Book of Discipline."

One of the Articles ordered by the Assembly at Edinburgh, December 25, 1564, to be presented to the Queen, was—"To require that Superintendents might be placed in the realm where none were, viz. in the *Merse*, *Teviotdale*, *Forest of Tweedale*, and the rest of the *Dales* in the *South*, not provided; with *Aberdeen*, and the other parts of the *North* likewise destitute." So it is in the MSS. Petrie[2] has it only in short—"*That Superintendents be placed where none are*;" but, as it is in the MSS., it shows plainly that, now that the Church was of four years standing, and the number of qualified men was increasing, the Assembly were for increasing proportionably the number of Superintendents, as is demonstrated thus:—By the establishment in the "First Book of Discipline," the Superintendent of Lothian's Diocese comprehended the sheriffdoms of Lothian, Stirling, Merse, Lauderdale, and Tweedale.[3] Spottiswoode was set over this Diocese in March 1560-1. He was still alive, and in the exercise of his office; and yet here, now,

[1] Knox, 297; Petrie, 223, MSS. [2] Petrie, 341.
[3] Spottiswoode, 158.

the Assembly craves that Superintendents may be placed in the Merse and Tweedale, and the *rest* of the *Dales*. From which it follows, that that which was but *one* Diocese, anno 1560, when qualified men were few, was designed by the Assembly, anno 1564, when the number of qualified men was somewhat increased, to be divided at least into *three* or *four*:—exactly agreeable to what I have all along asserted.

In the Assembly at Edinburgh, July 20, anno 1567—that famous Assembly whereof Buchanan was *Moderator*, and which tumbled Queen Mary from her throne—it was agreed by the Nobility and Barons on the one hand, and the Church on the other—"That all the Popish clergy should be dispossessed, and that Superintendents, ministers, and other NEEDFUL MEMBERS of the Kirk, should be planted in their places." So it is in the MSS., and so Spottiswoode hath it.[1] But both Calderwood and Petrie, though they mention the thing, yet labour to obscure it; for they do not so much as name *Superintendents*, far less take notice that they are reckoned among the *necessary members*, or were to *succeed* the *Popish* Bishops.[2] Farther, by the Assembly at Edinburgh, July 1, 1568, it is resolved—"To advise with my Lord Regent's Grace and Council, that in the rooms and countries where no Superintendents are, they may be placed." So the MSS. and Petrie.[3] Nay, doth not Calderwood himself tell us, that the Assembly holden at Edinburgh, March 1, 1570, when it appointed the Order to be observed thereafter in handling affairs brought before General Assemblies, ordained, in the *sixth place*, that "the complaints of countries for want of Superintendents should be heard and provided for," &c.[4] Further, doth not the same Calderwood record, that when in the year 1574 the Superintendents of Angus, Lothian, and Strathern,[5] would have demitted their office, the Assembly would not admit of their demission, but ordered them to continue in their function?[6] For what reason they offered to demit, perhaps, we shall learn hereafter. All I am concerned for at present is, that the Assembly would needs continue them in their office

[1] Spottiswoode, 210. [2] Petrie, 356; Calderwood, 42.
[3] Petrie, 360. [4] Calderwood, 46.
[5] [Erskine, Spottiswoode, and Winram.—E.] [6] Ibid. 65.

now, *fourteen* years after the first legal establishment of the Reformation. The truth is, this Assembly was holden in *March*, and Mr Andrew Melville, the *Protoplast* Presbyterian in *Scotland*, came not to the kingdom till *July* thereafter.

By this time, I think, I have made it appear that our Reformers intended nothing less than to make *Superintendency* only *temporary*, and subservient to the *then* pretended *necessities* of the Church. And likewise I have sufficiently made it appear, that it was merely for scarcity of qualified men, that so few Superintendents were at first designed by the "First Book of Discipline;" which was the one half of my gloss upon the controverted period in that Book. The other half, which was, that when once the Church was competently provided with parish ministers the Superintendents were no longer obliged to their *evangelistical* way of travelling constantly through their Dioceses, to preach, &c., is plain from what both Petrie and Spottiswoode agree in, as contained in the Book, viz. That they were to follow that method no longer than their kirks were provided of ministers, or at least of readers.[1]

Thus I have dispatched the first thing which was proposed to be inquired into, viz. Whether there was any sufficient *fund*, in the records of these times, for believing that our Reformers intended that Superintendency should only be *temporary*. It remains now that we should consider the 2. viz. What force or solidity is in the reason insisted on by our Presbyterian brethren to make this pretence seem plausible.

The reason insisted on by them is—"the force of necessity, there being so few men then qualified for the ministry; scarcely one in a province," &c. Now, who sees not that this so often repeated reason is entirely naught and inconsequential? For what though in these times there were few qualified men for the ministry? How follows it that therefore it was necessary to raise up Superintendents, and set them above their brethren? If the principles of *parity* had then been the *modish* principles, could not these *few* who were qualified have governed the Church suitably to these principles? Suppose we *twenty*, *thirty*, *forty* men in the kingdom, qualified

[1] Petrie, 219; Spottiswoode, 159.

for the office of the ministry,—could notthese *twenty*, *thirty*, or *forty*, have divided the kingdom into a proportionable number of large parishes? And still, as more men turned qualified, could they not have lessened these greater parishes, till they had multiplied them to as great a number as they pleased, or was convenient? It was *easy* to have done so; so very *obvious* as well as *easy*, that it is not be doubted, they would have done so if they had been of these principles. Why might not they have done so, as well as our Presbyterian brethren now a-days, *unite* Presbyteries where they have a scarcity of ministers of their persuasion? Where lies the impossibility of *uniting parishes* more than *uniting Presbyteries?* Indeed, this way of reasoning is more dangerous than it seems our Presbyterian brethren are aware of, for it quite cuts the sinews of *parity*, and demonstrates irrefragably that it cannot be the *model* our blessed Lord instituted for the government of his Church. For who can believe He would institute a *model* of government for his Church which could not answer the ends of its institution? And is it not plain that *parity* cannot answer the ends for which Church government was instituted, if the Church can be reduced to that state that the governors thereof, *forced by necessity*, must lay it aside, and *for a time* establish a *Prelacy?* Besides, what *strange divinity* is it to maintain that *parity* is of *Divine institution*, and yet may be laid aside in *cases* of *necessity?* It is true, G[ilbert] R[ule], in his "True Representation of Presbyterian Government," cited before, is bold to publish to the world *such* divinity, but let him talk what he will of the *case of necessity*, the *force of necessity*, the *law of necessity*—let him put it in as many languages as he pleases, as well as he hath done in Latin, telling that *necessitas quicquid coegit, defendit*—though, I must confess, I have seen few authors more unhappy at Latin—and all that shall never persuade me, ought never persuade any Christian, that *any necessity* can oblige Christians to *forsake*, far less to *cross*, Christ's institutions; for if it can oblige to do so in *one* case, why not in *all* cases? Indeed, to talk of *crossing* Christ's institutions when *forced* to it by the laws of necessity, what is it else than to open a door to *Gnosticism*, to *infidelity*, to *apostacy*, to all imaginable kinds of *antichristian perfidy* and *villainy?* But enough of

this at present. That which I am concerned for is only this, that, being it was so very obvious and easy for our Reformers to have cast the very first *scheme* of the government of the Church according to the *rules* and *exigencies* of *Parity*, if they had believed the *Divine* and *indispensible institution* of it; and being that they did it not, we have all the reason in the world to believe that they believed no such principle. For my part, I am so far from thinking it reasonable that Prelacy should be only needful where there is a scarcity of men qualified to be ministers, that, on the contrary, I do profess I am of opinion that Prelacy seems to be every whit as needful and expedient, if not more, supposing we had it in our power to *cut* and *carve* (as we say) on Christ's institutions, where there are *many* as where there are *few* ministers. Sure I am experience hath taught so, and teaches so daily; and as sure I am, it can with great reason be accounted for why it should be so; but if it is so, I think, it is only *help at a dead life* (as we say) to say that Superintendency was established at our Reformation only because of the *scarcity* of *men qualified* to be ministers. And so I proceed to our brethren's next reason, which is—

Secondly, That "*Superintendency was not the same with Episcopacy.*" Calderwood assigns seven or eight differences between *Superintendents* and *Bishops*;[1] and his faithful disciple G[ilbert] R[ule], in his "First Vindication," in answer to the First Question, resumes the same plea, and insists mostly on the same differences. Calderwood reckons thus—

"1. In the election, examination, and admission of ministers, the Superintendents were bound to the Order prescribed in the fourth Head of the First Book of Discipline, which is far different from the Order observed by Prelates.

"2. Superintendents kept not the bounds nor the limits of the old Dioceses.

"3. Superintendents might not remain above twenty days in any place till they had passed through the whole bounds; must preach at least thrice in the week; must stay no longer in the chief town of their charge than three or four

[1] Calderwood, 26, 27.

months at most; but must re-enter in visitation of the rest of the kirks in their bounds. Bishops think preaching the least of their charge.

"4. The election, examination, and admission of the Superintendent is set down far different from the election, examination, and admission of Bishops now-a-days, &c.

"5. Superintendents were admitted without other ceremonies than sharp examination, &c. To the inauguration of a Bishop is required the Metropolitan's consecrations.

"6. There were no degrees of superior and inferior, provincial and general Superintendents. It is otherwise in the Hierarchy of the Prelates," &c.

I have set down these six *huge* differences, without ever offering to consider them particularly. Are they not *huge* differences? Behold them, examine them carefully; is not each of them as *essential* and *specific* as another? Think not, courteous reader, it was *malice* or *ill-will* to Episcopacy made our author muster up these differences. These make but a small number. If he had been acted by *passion* or *vicious bias*—if his malice had been vigorous and earnest to discharge itself that way, he could have easily reckoned six hundred, every whit as considerable differences. He might have told them that Bishops wore *black hats*, and Superintendents *blue bonnets;* that Bishops wore *silks*, and Superintendents *tartan;* that Bishops wore *gowns* and *cassocks*, and Superintendents *trews* and *slasht doublets;* and, God knows, how many such differences he might have readily collected. And if he had adduced such *notable* differences as these, he had done every way as *philosophically*, and as like a good *difference-maker*. But, in the mean time, what is all this to *parity* or *imparity* amongst the governors of the Church? Do these *differences* he has adduced *distinguish* between Bishops and Superintendents as to pre-eminence of *power* and the essentials of *Prelacy?* Do they prove that Superintendents had no prerogative, no authority, no jurisdiction, over parish ministers? I have treated him thus coarsely, because I know no other way of treatment authors deserve who will needs speak *nonsense* rather than speak nothing.

It is true, indeed, one difference he has mentioned, which seems something material, and therefore I shall endeavour

to account for it with some more seriousness. It is, that by the constitution, as we have it, both in the "First Book of Discipline," and the "Form and Order of electing Superintendents," Superintendents were made "obnoxious to the trial and censures of the ministers within their own Diocese." This I acknowledge to be true; and I acknowledge further, that herein there was a considerable difference between *them* and *Bishops*, as Bishops stood eminenced above Presbyters in the Primitive times, and as they ought to stand eminenced above them in all well constituted Churches. But then I have these things to say—

1. I shall not scruple to acknowledge that herein our Reformers were in the wrong, and that this was a great error in the constitution. I do avowedly profess, I do not think myself bound to justify every thing that was done by our Reformers. If that falls to any man's share, it falls to theirs who established this Article in the "Claim of Right," which gave occasion to this whole Inquiry. That our Reformers herein were in the wrong, I say, I make no scruple to acknowledge; and I think it cannot but be obvious to all who have spent but a few thoughts about matters of *policy* and *government*. Indeed, to make governors subject to the censures and sentences of their subjects, what is it else than to subvert government, to confound relations, to sap the foundations of all order and politic establishment? "It is"—as King James VI. has it in his Discourse about the "True Law of Free Monarchies,"[1] and I cannot give it better—"to invert the order of all law and reason, to make the commanded command the commander, the judged judge their judge, and them who are governed to govern, their time about, their lord and governor." In short, to give a just account of such a constitution, it is very near of kin to that *bantering* question I have sometimes heard proposed to children or idiots—"*If you were above me, and I above you, which of us should be uppermost?*"

2. I add further, that, as I take it, our Reformers put this in the constitution, that they might appear consequential to a principle then espoused and put in practice by them about civil governments, which was—that the King was

[1] King James' Works, p. 202.

superior to his subjects in their distributive, but inferior to them in their collective, capacity.[1] This principle, I say, in those days was in great credit. Knox had learned it from the *democratians* at Geneva; his authority was great; and he was very *fond* of this principle, and disseminated it with a singular zeal and confidence. Besides, our Reformers were then obnoxious to the civil government; the standing laws were against them; and the sovereign's persuasion, in matters of religion, jumped with the laws. This principle, therefore (had it been a good one), came to them most seasonably; and coming to them in such a nick, and, withal, meeting in them with *Scotch metal*,[2] they put it in practice; and being put in practice, God suffered it to be successful; and the success was a new endearment, and so it came to be a principle of credit and reputation. Indeed, they had been very unthankful to it, and inconsequential to boot, if they had not adopted it into their *ecclesiastical* as well as their *civil system;* and the Superintendents, having had a main hand in reducing it to practice against the prince, could not take it ill if it was made a law to themselves—it was but their own measure. This, I say, I take to be the natural history of this part of the constitution.

Nay, 3. So fond, it seems, they were of this principle that they extended it further—so far as even to make ministers accountable to their own *elderships*. So it is expressly established by the "First Book of Discipline," Head 8[3]—"The elders ought also to take heed to the life, manners, diligence, and study of their minister; and if he be worthy of admonition, they must admonish him; if of correction, they must correct him; and if he be worthy of deposition, they, with the consent of the Church and Superintendent, may depose him." Here was a *pitch* of *democracy* which, I think, our Presbyterian brethren themselves, as *self-denied* as they are, would not take with so very kindly. And yet I am apt to believe the compilers of the Book never thought on putting these *elders* in a state of *parity* with their ministers; though this is a demonstration, that they have not been the greatest masters at *drawing schemes* of *policy*.

4. But to let this pass: though this unpolitical stroke

[1] Major singulis, minor universis.

[2] Præfervidum Scotorum ingenium. [3] Spottiswoode, 167.

(to call it no worse) was made part of the constitution of that Book, as I have granted, yet I have no where found that ever it was put in practice. I have no where found that, *de facto*, a Superintendent was *judged* by his own *Synod*; whether it was, that they behaved so exactly, as that they were never censurable, or that their Synods had not the insolence to reduce a constitution so very absurd and unreasonable to practice, I shall not be anxious to determine. But it seems probable it has been as much, if not more, upon the latter account than the former, for I find Superintendents frequently tried, and sometimes censured, by General Assemblies; and there was reason for it, supposing that General Assemblies, as then constituted, were fit to be the supreme judicatories of the national Church, for there was no reason that Superintendents should have been *Popes*, i. e. absolute and unaccountable. So that, if I am not mistaken, our brethren *raise dust* to little purpose, when they make so much noise about the accountableness of Superintendents to General Assemblies, as if that made a difference between them and Bishops; for I know no man that makes Bishops unaccountable, especially when they are *confederated* in a *National* Church. But this by the way. That which I take notice of is, that seeing we find they were so frequently tried by General Assemblies, without the least intimation of their being at any time tried by their own Synods, it seems reasonable to conclude, that it has been thought fit to let that unreasonable *stretch* in the first constitution fall into desuetude; but however this was, I have all safe enough.

For 5. Such a constitution infers no such thing as *parity* amongst the officers of the Church. Those who maintain that the King is *inferior* to his subjects, in their *collection*, are not yet so extravagant as to say he is not *superior* to every *one* of them in their *distribution*. They acknowledge he is *major singulis*, and there is not a person in the kingdom who will be so unmannerly as to say that he stands upon the same level with his sovereign. But what needs more? These same very Presbyterian authors who use this argument, even *while* they use it, confess that *Superintendents* and ordinary *parish ministers* did not *act* in *parity*; and because they *cannot* deny it, but *must* confess it, whether they will or not, they cannot forbear raising all the dust

they can about it, that unthinking people may not see clearly that they do confess it. And had it not been for this reason, I am apt to think the world had never been plagued with such pitiful *jangle* as such arguments amount to.

Neither is the next any better, which is, 3—"That Superintendency was never established by Act of Parliament." This is G[ilbert] R[ule]'s argument in his learned answer to the first of the Ten Questions; for there he tells us that "Superintendency was neither brought in, nor cast out, by Act of Parliament." And what, then? Doth he love it the worse that it was established purely by ecclesiastical authority? How long since he turned *fond* of *Parliamentary* establishments? I wonder he was not afraid of the *scandal* of *Erastianism*. But to the point. It is true, indeed, it was not brought in by Act of Parliament, but then I think he himself cannot deny that it was countenanced, allowed, and approven, by more than *half a dozen* of Acts of Parliaments; which, if our author understands any thing either of *law* or *logic*, he must allow to be at least *equivalent* to a Parliamentary *inbringing*. I have these Acts in readiness to produce when I shall be put to it, but I think his own Act, which he cited, though most ridiculously, as shall be made appear afterwards, in the immediately preceding paragraph, may be good enough for *him*. For he concludes it as evident that "Episcopal jurisdiction over the Protestants was condemned by law in the Parliament 1567, because it is there statute and ordained that no other jurisdiction ecclesiastical be acknowledged within this realm than that which is, and shall be, within this same Kirk established presently, or which floweth therefrom, concerning preaching the Word, correcting of manners, administration of Sacraments; and Prelatical jurisdiction was not then in Scotland." So he reasons. Now, I dare adventure to refer it to his own judgment, whether it will not by the same way of reasoning follow, and be as evident, that the *jurisdiction of Superintendents* was allowed of by this same Act, seeing he himself cannot have the *brow* to deny that it was then in its vigour, and daily exercised? I think this is argument good enough *ad hominem*, but, as I said, we shall have more of this Act of Parliament hereafter.

Thus I have dispelled some of these clouds our Presbyterian

brethren use to raise about the *Prelacy* of *Superintendents*.[1] Perhaps there may be more of them, but considering

[1] [Our author was not concerned to prove Superintendency and Episcopacy the same, but in opposition to the clause in the "Claim of Right," which asserted that "superiority of any office in the Church above Presbyters hath been a great and insupportable grievance to Scotland ever since the Reformation, it having been reformed from Popery by Presbyters," to establish the fact that the Reformers of this country had no idea of *parity* among ecclesiastics; and that, therefore, in the religious system which they set up in place of the Church which was overthrown, there were manifest marks of imparity, and unequivocal symptoms of superiority of offices above Presbyters. It is not necessary for Episcopal writers to defend the opinions of the Scottish Reformers, with whom their Church has no connexion, or to admire the crude substitute for the Apostolical constitution which they erected. But it is very important that they should correct the false impression which even the writings of historians, in the main favourable to Catholic order, have tended to create, by the loose manner in which they speak of the Presbyterianism of Knox, and the Anti-Episcopal character of the Knoxian system. There never was a greater error, and by exposing it we deprive Presbyterianism of the potent charm with which it is invested in the minds of the Scottish people, from its imaginary association with that wonderful man, and oblige its advocates to seek some other origin for it, which, when known, is by no means likely to be palateable to a people, whose chief characteristic is national pride. It must be obvious to every candid person who peruses these pages, or who is otherwise familiar with the actual state of Superintendency, and the extraordinary restrictions under which it was placed, that it *was almost as remote from Episcopacy* in externals (to say nothing of the *want of the valid Succession*, which is the life-germ of the Apostolical Order), as it *was from Presbyterianism*. The Superintendents were subject to the *censures of their own Synods* by the First Book of Discipline; though they were placed above, and were authorised to *supervise, the individual members* composing those Synods. This regulation, putting aside its absurdity, shews that those who framed it had no proper idea of the ecclesiastical power of Bishops, and of the fitness that, in cases of delinquency, they should at least be tried by their Peers. It is not surprising, therefore, that after *ten years'* probation it was found impracticable to carry out a system of such a questionable kind; and that those who devised it were earnest and foremost in bringing in another, better digested, and more assimilated to the ancient Hierarchy. That the succeeding regime established by the Convention of Leith was the child of those who had devised the previous system, and was favourably received by Knox, is a *tolerably strong proof of their leanings*, unless we suppose them to have been actuated entirely by temporal motives, for which there is no ground. And when it is remembered that in the meantime they gladly availed themselves of the assistance of the few real and titular Prelates who joined the Reformed cause, there can be no doubt that they were *not indisposed* to the existence of "any superiority of office in the Church above Presbyters," and that the assertion that the *Reformation* was *brought about by Presbyters* in the sense in which modern writers use the term—for in reality being *schismatics and laymen, it is of no consequence by what order this land was reformed—is unsupported by facts*.—E.]

the weakness of these, which certainly are the strongest, it is easy to conjecture what the rest may be, if there are any more of them. And thus, I think, I have fairly accounted for the sentiments of our Reformers in relation to *parity* or *imparity* amongst the governors of the Church during the *first scheme* into which they cast the government of the Church.

Before I proceed to the next I must go back a little, and give a brief deduction of some things which may afford considerable light, both to what I am now to insist on, and what I have insisted on already. Though I am most unwilling to rake into the mistakes or weaknesses of our Reformers, yet I cannot but say that our Reformation was carried on, and at first established, upon some principles very disadvantageous to the Church both as to her *polity* and *patrimony*. There were mistakes in the ministers on the one hand, and sinister and worldly designs amongst the laity on the other; and both concurred unhappily to produce great evils in the result.

There was a principle had then got too much footing amongst some Protestant divines, viz. that the best way to reform a Church was to recede as far from the Papists as they could; to have nothing in common with them but the essentials—the necessary and indispensable articles and parts of Christian religion. Whatever was in its nature indifferent, and not positively and expressly commanded in the Scriptures, if it was in fashion in the Popish churches, was therefore to be laid aside, and avoided as a corruption—as having been abused, and made subservient to superstition and idolatry.

This principle John Knox was fond of, and maintained zealously, and the rest of our Reforming preachers were much acted by his influences. In pursuance of this principle, therefore, when they compiled the First Book of Discipline they would not reform the old polity, and purge it of such corruptions as had crept into it, keeping still by the main draughts and lineaments of it, which undoubtedly had been the wiser, the safer, and every way the better course, as they were then admonished even by some of the *Popish* clergy;[1] but they laid it quite aside, and instead thereof

[1] Spottiswoode, 174.

hammered out a *new scheme*, keeping at as great a distance from the *old one* as they could, and as the essentials of polity would allow them, establishing no such thing, however, as *parity*, as I have fully proven. And no wonder, for as *imparity* has obviously more of *order*, *beauty*, and *usefulness*, in its aspect, so it had never, so much as by dreaming, entered their thoughts that it was a *limb* of *Antichrist*, or a *relic* of *Popery*.

That our Reformers had the aforesaid principle in their view all alongst, while they digested the "First Book of Discipline," is plain to every one that reads it. Thus, in the first Head, they condemn "binding men and women to a several and disguised apparel—to the superstitious observing of fasting days—keeping of holidays of certain Saints commanded by man, such as be all these THE PAPISTS HAVE INVENTED, as the Feasts of the *Apostles*, *Martyrs*, *Christmas*," &c.[1] In the second Head, the *cross in Baptism*, and *kneeling* at the reception of the symbols in the Eucharist. In the third head, they require not only "idolatry," but "all its monuments and places to be suppressed;" and amongst the rest, "chapels, cathedral churches, and colleges," i. e., as I take it, *collegiate churches*. And many other such instances might be adduced particularly as to our present purpose. They would not call those, whom they truly and really stated in a *Prelacy* above their brethren, *Prelates* or *Bishops*, but *Superintendents*. They would not allow of *imposition of hands* in ordinations; they made *Superintendents* subject to the *censures* of their own *Synods;* they changed the *bounds* of the *Dioceses*; they would not allow the *Superintendents* the *same* revenues which *Prelates* had had before; they would not suffer *ecclesiastical benefices* to stand *distinguished* as they had been formerly; but they were for casting them all for *once* into *one* heap, and making a new division of the Church's patrimony, and parcelling it out in competencies, as they thought it most expedient. In short, a notable instance of the prevalency of this principle we have even in the year 1572, after the restoration of the *old polity* was agreed to; for then, by many in the General Assembly, exceptions were taken at the *titles* of "Archbishop, Dean, Archdeacon, Chancellor, Chap-

[1] Spottiswoode, 153.

ter," &c. as being *Popish titles*, and *offensive* to the ears of good Christians, as all historians agree.[1] But, then, as they were for these and the like alterations in pursuance of this principle, so they were zealous for, and had no mind to part with, the *patrimony* of the Church. Whatever had been dedicated to religious uses—whatever, under the notion of either *spirituality* or *temporality*, had belonged to either *seculars* or *regulars* before, they were *positive* should still continue in the Church's hands, and be applied to her maintenance and advantages, condemning all dilapidations, alienations, impropriations, and laick usurpations and possessions of church revenues, &c. as is to be seen fully in the sixth Head of the Book.[2] Thus, I say, our Reformers had digested a *new scheme* of polity in the "First Book of Discipline,"[3] laying aside the *old one*, because they thought it too much *Popish*; and now that we have this Book under consideration, it will not be unuseful, nay, it will be needful, for a full understanding of what follows, to *fix* the time when it was written.

Knox (and Calderwood follows him) says[4] it was written after the dissolution of the Parliament which sat in August 1560, and gave the legal establishment to the Reformation. But Petrie says,[5] it is expressly affirmed in the beginning of the Book itself, that the commission was granted for compiling it on the 29th of April 1560, and that they brought it to a conclusion, "*as they could for the time*," before the *20th of May*, a short enough time, I think, for a work of such importance. So Petrie affirms, I say, and it is apparent he is in the right, for his account agrees exactly with the *first* nomination of Superintendents, which both Knox and Spottiswoode affirm to have been made in *July* that year;[6] and, besides, it falls in naturally with the *series* of the history, for the Nobility and gentry having seen the Book, and considered it before the Parliament sat, according to this account, makes it

[1] Spottiswoode, 260; Petrie, 376; Calderwood, 58.

[2] Spottiswoode, 164.

[3] [This Book was compiled by the same persons who drew up the Confession of Faith, which was presented to and ratified by the Parliament in 1560, viz.—Winram, Spottiswoode, Willox, Douglas (afterwards the first Titular Archbishop of St Andrews), Row, and Knox.—E.]

[4] Knox, 283; Calderwood, 21.

[5] Petrie, 218.

[6] Knox, 259, 260; Spottiswoode, 149

fairly intelligible how it was entirely neglected, or rather rejected, not only so far as that it was never allowed of nor approven by them, as we shall learn by and bye; but so far that in that Parliament no provision at all was made for the maintenance and subsistence of the Reformed ministers. For understanding this more fully, yet it is to be considered that there had been disceptations and controversies the year before, viz. 1559, about the disposal of the *patrimony* of the Church. This I learn from a letter of Knox to Calvin, dated August 28, 1559, to be seen among Calvin's Epistles, Col. 441, wherein he asks his sentiments about this question —"Whether the yearly revenues might be paid to such as had been monks and Popish priests, even though they should confess their former errors, considering that they neither served the Church, nor were capable to do it?" and tells him frankly that he had maintained the negative, for which he was called too severe, not only by the Papists, but even by many Protestants.[1] From which it is plain not only that there were then controversies about the disposal of the patrimony of the Church, as I have said, but also that Knox, (and by very probable consequence the Protestant preachers generally), was clear that the ecclesiastical revenues had been primarily destinated to the Church for the ends of religion; and, therefore, whatever person could not serve these ends could have no *just title* to these revenues. By which way of reasoning, not only ignorant *priests* and *monks*, but all *laymen* whatsoever, were excluded from having any title to the patrimony of the Church.

Now, while this controversy was in agitation as to point of *right*, the guise was going against Knox's side of it as to matter of *fact:* for in the mean time many abbeys and monasteries were thrown down, and the Nobility and gentry were daily possessing themselves of the estates that had belonged to them. And so, before the "First Book of Discipline," which was Knox's performance—and so, no doubt, contained his principle—was compiled, *they* were finding that there was something *sweet* in *sacrilege*, and were by no means willing to part with what they had got so fortunately, as

[1] Hæc, quia nego, plus æquo severus judicor, non a solis Papisticis, verum etiam ab iis qui sibi veritatis patroni videntur.

they thought, in their fingers. Besides, they foresaw, if Knox's project took place, several other, which they judged considerable, inconvenients would follow. If the *monks* and *priests*, &c. who acknowledged their former errors, should be so treated, what might *they* expect who *persisted* in their adherence to the *Romish faith* and *interests?* Though they were blinded with superstition and error, yet they were *men;* they were *Scottish men;* nay, they were generally of their own *blood*, and their very near *kinsmen;* and would it not be very hard to deprive them entirely of their livings, and reduce them who had their estates settled upon them by law, and had lived so plentifully and so hospitably, to such a hopeless state of misery and arrant beggary? Further, by this scheme, as they behoved to part with what they had already griped, so their hopes of ever having opportunity to profit themselves of the revenues of the Church thereafter were more effectually discouraged, than they had been even in the times of Popery. The Popish clergy, by their *rules*, were bound to live single; they could not marry, nor, by consequence, have *lawful children* to provide for. The Reformed, as the law of God allowed them, and their inclinations prompted them, indulged themselves the *solaces* of *wedlock*, and begot children, and had families to maintain and provide for. There were no such expectations, therefore, of easy leases, and rich gifts, and hidden legacies, &c., from them as from the *Popish* clergy. Add to this, the *Popish* clergy foresaw the *ruin* of the *Romish* interests; they saw no likelihood of *successors* of their own *stamp* and *principles*. They had a mighty spite at the Reformation. It was not likely, therefore, that they would be anxious what became of the patrimony of the Church after they were gone. It was to be hoped they might squander it away, dilapidate, alienate, &c., without difficulty (as indeed they did); and who but themselves (the laity) should have all this gain? Upon these and the like considerations, I say, the Nobility and gentry had no liking to the "First Book of Discipline;" and being once out of love with it, it was easy to get arguments enough against it. The *novelties*, and the numerous *needless recessions* from the *old* polity which were in it, furnished these both obviously and abundantly. So it was not only not established, but, it seems, the Nobility and

gentry, who have ever the principal sway in Scottish Parliaments, to let the ministers find how much they had displeased them by such a draught, resolved to serve them a trick. Indeed, they served them a *monstrous one;* for, though in the Parliament 1560, they established the Reformation as to *doctrine* and *worship*, &c., and by a *legal definition* made the *Protestant* the *National* Church, yet they settled not so much as a *groat* of the Church's *revenues* upon its ministers, but continued the *Popish* clergy, during their lives, in their possessions.

It is true, indeed, through the importunity of John Knox and some others of the preachers, some Noblemen and gentlemen subscribed the Book[1] in January 1560–1;[2] but as they were not serious, as Knox intimates, so they did it with this *express provision*, apparently levelled against one of the main designs of the Book—"That the Bishops, Abbots, Priors, and other Prelates, and beneficed men, who had already joined themselves to the religion, should enjoy the rents of their benefices during their lives, they sustaining the ministers for their parts," &c. But it was never generally received: on the contrary, it was treated in ridicule, and called a DEVOUT IMAGINATION, which offended Knox exceedingly.[3] Nay, it seems the ministers themselves were not generally pleased with it after second thoughts, or the laity have been more numerous in the General Assembly holden in December 1561. For, as Knox himself tells us,[4] when it was moved there that the Book should be offered to the Queen, and her Majesty should be supplicated to ratify it, the motion was rejected.

The Reformation thus established, and through the *badness*, or at least the *disagreeableness*, of the scheme laid down in the Book on the one hand, and the *selfish* and *sacrilegious* ends of the laity on the other, no provision made for the ministers, it was unavoidable that they should be *pinched*.

[1] [The subscribers were "the Duke of Chatelherault, the Earls of Arran, Argyll, Glencairn, Marischal, Menteith, Morton, and Rothes, the Lords Yester, Boyd, Ochiltree, Sanquhar, and Lindsay, the Bishop of Galloway, the Dean of Moray (Alexander Campbell), the Lairds of Drumlanrig, Lochinvar, Garlies, Bargeny, and "divers burgesses."—E.]

[2] Knox, 282, 283; Spottiswoode, 175.

[3] Knox, Ibid.; Spottiswoode, 174.

[4] Knox, 323.

And *pinched* they were, indeed, to purpose; for, for full *eighteen* or *nineteen months* after the Reformation was established by law they had nothing to live by but *shift* or *charity;* and, which heightened the misery all this time of want, they had little or no prospect of the end of it, for when a Parliament, so much Protestant as in the Queen's absence to establish the *purity* of *doctrine*, &c., had treated them so unkindly, what was to be expected now that *she* was at home, every *inch* Popish, and zealously such? Though a Parliament should now incline to pity them, yet how could it meet? Or what could it do without the sovereign's allowance? And what ground had they to hope that she would befriend them? Indeed, nothing was to be attempted that way. It was not to be expected that the Popish clergy should be dispossessed of the revenues of the Church, and the Reformed entitled to them by Act of Parliament. Another *project* was to be fallen upon.

The *project* fallen upon was, that the Council, then entirely *Protestant*, should deal with the Queen to oblige the *Popish* clergy, possessors of the benefices, to resign the *thirds* of them into her Majesty's hands, that they might be a *fund* for the maintenance of *Protestant ministers.* The nation was then *generally* Protestant, and that *interest* was too strong for the Queen, so that they were not to be too much provoked. Besides, one argument was used which prevailed much with her Majesty. The revenues of the Queen were then very low, and she loved to spend; and pains were taken to persuade her that beside what would be subsistence enough for the ministers, she would be sure to have what might considerably relieve her own necessities. This was a taking proposition, so the project succeeded. The Popish clergy were put to it, and resigned the thirds.[1] Collectors were appointed to bring them into the Exchequer. The ministers were thence to receive their allowances. Well! Were they well enough provided now? Alas! poor men! it was but little that was pretended to be provided for them—the *thirds* of these benefices which the *laity* had not already *swallowed:*[2] and yet far less was their real portion. They found

[1] Knox, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, &c.

[2] [Even of *this* the ministers did not get their full share, for the clergy

by sad experience, that it was not for nothing that the thirds were ordered to be brought into the Queen's treasury. For when they came to be divided, how mean were their allotments? An hundred merks Scottish, i. e. about five pounds eleven shillings English, to an ordinary minister in the country! "Three hundred," saith Knox,[1] "was the highest that was appointed to any, except the Superintendents and a few others." All this the ministers, indeed, resented highly. John Knox[2] said publickly in his sermon—"If that order for maintaining the ministers ended well his judgment failed him, for he saw two parts freely given to the Devil, the Popish clergy, and the third must be divided betwixt God and the Devil," i. e. betwixt the Protestant ministers and the Popish Queen. And no doubt her share was truly considerable. But neither did the misery end here, as poor as these small pittances were, they could not have them either *seasonably*, or *fully* paid. The thirds came in but slowly, and the Queen's necessities behoved to be first served, by which means the ministers were forced to wait many times very long for their money, and sometimes to take *little*, rather than want *all*. In short, their sense of the treatment they met with was so lively, that this turned to a proverb amongst them—"The good Laird of Pittaro[3] was ane

continued to give in false returns of their existing rentals, which of course greatly diminished the Thirds. Vide Spottiswoode, p. 183.—E.]

[1] P. 329. [2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid.—[The old mansion of Pitarrow, the patrimonial property of the Wisharts, was situated in the parish of Fordoun in the shire of Kincardine. It was long a ruin, and scarcely a vestige of it now remains. The proprietor here mentioned was John, the eldest brother of George Wishart the "*Martyr*." He was engaged in most of the conferences between the Queen-Dowager and the Lords of the Congregation in 1559, and being present in the Parliament which met in August 1560 (Acta Parl. Scot. vol. ii. p. 525), he was one of the twenty-four individuals elected to conduct the Government, of whom eight were to be chosen by the Queen-Dowager, and six by the Nobility. In 1561, after the return of Queen Mary from France, he was appointed a Privy Councillor, and Comptroller of Scotland, which office he held until 1563, when he was succeeded by Sir William Murray of Tullibardine, the ancestor of the Ducal Family of Atholl. Beatson's Political Index, 8vo. London, 1806, vol. iii. p. 89. His attachment to the Earl of Moray drew him into rebellion, and caused him the loss of his office of Comptroller. He afterwards accompanied his friend and patron into England, and having returned with him after the murder of Rizzio, he received a pardon for his rebellion in March 1566. In

earnest professor of Christ, but the great Devil receive the Controller." Thus, poor men! they were hardly treated: they had great charges, and a weighty task; and they were ill provided, and worse paid.

This bred them much work in their General Assemblies, for scarcely did they ever meet but a great part of their time was spent in forming petitions, and importuning the Government for relief of their necessities; but all in vain, they were never the better, no, not so much as *heard* almost, till July 1567. Then the Nobility and gentry resolved to lay aside the Queen from the government, and, finding it necessary to have the ministers of their side, began to bespeak them a little more kindly. Then, indeed, it was made the second article of that league into which they entered—"That the Act already made (by the Queen and Council) concerning the thirds of the benefices within this realm, principally for sustaining the ministers, should be duly put in execution, according to the order of the Book of the appointment of ministers' stipends, as well of them that are to be appointed, as of them who are already placed; and that the ministers should be first duly answered, and sufficiently sustained of the same, to the relief of their present necessity, aye and while a perfect order might be taken and established towards the full distribution of the patrimony of the Kirk, according to God's word." &c.

So I read in the MSS., and Spottiswoode[1] has the same upon the matter. But this was not all—*Burnt bairns fire dread*.[2] The ministers, sensible, it seems, of the *mean* and *uncertain* way of *living* they had had before, resolved now to make the best advantage they could of that opportunity;

1567 he joined the association against the Earl of Bothwell, and on the 19th of November that year was appointed an Extraordinary Lord of Session in the room of Dr Edward Henryson, then superseded. He accompanied Moray in 1568 to York, for the purpose of impeaching his sovereign before the Commissioners of the English Queen, and he figures afterwards in the Pacification of Perth, concluded 23d February 1573. History of King James the Sext, 4to. p. 132. He was reappointed an Extraordinary Lord of Session on the 18th of January 1574, in room of the Earl Marischal, according to the Pitmidden MSS.; but as the Books of Sederunt of the Court of Session of that date are lost, the particulars of the reappointment of this keen politician, and man "*of many offices*," are buried in oblivion.—E.]

[1] Spottiswoode, 209.

[2] [An old Scottish proverb.—E.]

and so they obtained this likewise for another article of that confederacy, and the Nobility promised—"That how soon a lawful Parliament might be had, or that the occasion might otherwise justly serve, they should labour at their uttermost that the faithful Kirk of Jesus Christ, professed within this realm, might be put in full liberty (i. e. possession) of the patrimony of the Kirk, according to the Book of God, and the order and practice of the Primitive Kirk, and that nothing should pass in Parliament, till the affairs of the Kirk were first considered, approved, and established; and also that they should reform themselves in the matters of the Church for their own parts; ordaining the contraveners and refusers of the same to be secluded from the bosom of the Kirk," &c. So the MSS., and Spottiswoode also.[1]

Here were fair promises indeed! Were not the ministers well enough secured now? Was not the patrimony of the Church now to run in its right channel? Alas! all promises are not performed. No sooner had these Nobles and Barons carried their main point, which was the *dethroning* of the Queen, to which also the ministers were forward enough, than they quite forgot their promises. For, though the Parliament met in December thereafter, and though the restitution of the patrimony of the Church was promised to be the first thing that should be done in Parliament, yet nothing like performance! Nay, though an Act was made for putting the Articles about the thirds in execution, yet the ministers were forced to wait long enough before they found the effects of it. In short, they continued in the same straits they had been in before, for full two years thereafter, that is, till July 1569, at which time I find, by the MSS. and Mr Petrie,[2] the Church was put in possession of the thirds, for which their necessities made them very thankful, as appears from the narrative of an Act of their Assembly at that time, which runs thus, as I find it in the MS.,—"Forasmuch as this long time bygone the ministers have been universally defrauded and postponed of their stipends, and now, at last, it hath pleased God to move the hearts of the superior power, and the Estates of this realm,"

[1] Spottiswoode, 209. [2] Petrie, 363.

&c.—a narrative which, it is probable, they would not have used when the thirds were at first *projected* for their maintenance; sure I am, of a quite different strain from Knox's resentment, which I mentioned before. But by this time experience had taught them "*to thank God for little*," and that it was even *good to be getting something*. However, all this while they continued still to have the same sentiments concerning the patrimony of the Church—that unless God, by immediate revolution, should *dispense* with her right, it belonged to her *unalienably*—that it was abominable sacrilege to defraud her of it—and that neither Church nor State could be happy so long as it was so much in the hands of laicks. And as they had still these sentiments (and no wonder, so long as they had any *sense* of religion), so they were still using their best endeavours, trying all experiments and watching all opportunities to bring the Nobility and gentry to a reasonable temper, and to put the Church in possession of her undoubted revenues; but all in vain. On the contrary, these *leeches* having once *tasted* of her *blood*, were *thirsting* still for *more*, and daily making farther encroachments. For a Parliament met in August 1571, and made an "Act, obliging all the subjects, who in former times had held their land and possessions of Priors, Prioresses, Convents of Friars and Nuns," &c., thereafter to hold them of the Crown. This was an awakening, an alarming Act. These who heretofore had possessed themselves of the Church's patrimony had done it by *force*, or by *connivance*—without *law*, and without *title*," so there were still hopes of recovering what was possessed so *illegally*. But this was to give them *law* on their side. As things stood then, it would be easy to obtain *gifts*, now that the King was made immediate superior; and then there was no recovering of what was thus *colourably* possessed. So, I say, it was an *awakening* Act of Parliament, and indeed it roused the spirits of the Clergy, and put them in a quicker motion. Now they began to see the error of drawing the *new scheme* of polity in the "First Book of Discipline," and receding from the *old one*. Now they perceived sensibly that that making of a *new one* had unhinged all the Church's interests, and exposed her patrimony, and made it a prey to the ravenous laity; and that it was therefore time—high time—for them to

bethink themselves, and try their strength and skill, if possibly a stop could be put to such notorious robbery.[1] And so I am fairly introduced to

The Second Model, into which the government of the Church was cast, after the public establishment of the Reformation. For the General Assembly of the Church, meeting at Stirling in that same month of August 1571—"Gave commission to certain brethren to go to the Lord Regent his Grace, and to the Parliament, humbly to request and desire, in name of the Kirk, the granting of such heads and articles, and redress of such complaints, as should be given to them by the Kirk," &c. So it is in the MSS. and so Spottiswoode and Petrie have it.[2] Before I proceed, there is one seeming difficulty which must be removed. It is, that this General Assembly met before the Parliament. How, then, could it be that Act of Parliament which so awakened them? But the solution is easy. In those times Parliaments did not sit so long as they are in use to do now; but all things were prepared, and in readiness before the Parliament met. "Proclamation was made a month or so before the Parliament was to meet, requiring all Bills to be given in to the Register,[3] which were to be presented in the succeeding Session of Parliament, that they might be brought to the King, or Regent, to be perused and considered by them; and only such as they allowed were to be put into the Chancellor's hands to be proponed to the Parliament, and none other," &c. Whoso pleases may see this account given by King James VI. of Scotland and I. of England to his *English* Parliament, in his speech dated 1607. Indeed, the thing is notorious, and Calderwood himself gives a remarkable instance of this method,[4] for he tells how, in the end of April, or beginning of May 1621—"A charge was published by proclamation, commanding all that had suits, articles, or petitions to propone to the Parliament, to give them into the Clerk of the Register before the 20th day of May, that by him they might be presented to so many of the Council, who were appointed by his Majesty

[1] Vide Spottiswoode, 258. [2] Spottiswoode, 258; Petrie, 371.
[3] [The Lord Clerk Register, who collected the votes in the Scottish Parliament.—E.] [4] Calderwood, 759.

to meet some days before the Parliament, and to consider the said bills, petitions, and articles, with certification that the same should not be received, read, nor voted in Parliament, except they were passed under his Highness' hand." And yet the same Calderwood tells us,[1] that the Parliament was not appointed to meet till the *twenty-third of July*; so that here were *two full months* between the giving in of the bills, &c. and the meeting of the Parliament. This being the custom in those times, it is easy to consider how the General Assembly, though it met some days before the Parliament, might know very well what was to be done in Parliament, for if this *Bill* was allowed by the *then* Regent to be presented, there was no doubt of its passing. And that it was very well known what the Parliament was to do in that matter, may be further evident from John Knox's letter, directed at that time to the General Assembly, wherein he is earnest with them that, "with all uprightness and strength in God, they gainstand the merciless devourers of the patrimony of the Church, telling them, that if men will spoil, let them do it to their own peril and damnation; but it was their duty to beware of communicating with their sins, but by public protestation to make it known to the world that they were innocent of robbery, which would ere long provoke God's vengeance upon the committers," &c. From which nothing can be clearer than that he had a special eye to that which was then in agitation, and to be done by the Parliament.[2] Having thus removed the seeming difficulty, I return to my purpose.

The Earl of Lennox was then Regent. He was murdered[3] in the time of the Parliament, so at that time things were in confusion, and these commissioners from the General Assembly could do nothing in their business. The Earl of Mar succeeded in the Regency. Application was made to him. It was agreed to, between his Grace and the clergy who applied to him, that a meeting should be kept, between so many for the *Church* and so many for the *State*, for adjusting

[1] Calderwood, 764.

[2] For this letter see Spottiswoode, 258, and Petrie, 370.

[3] [Lennox was shot on the High Street of Stirling during a riot by Captain Calder, at the instigation of the relatives of Archbishop Hamilton, who had been ignominiously executed by the Regent's authority.—E.]

matters. For this end, an Assembly was kept at Leith on the 12th of January 1571-2. By this Assembly *six* were delegated[1] to meet with as *many* to be nominated by the Council, "to treat, reason, and conclude, concerning the settlement of the polity of the Church." After "divers meetings and long deliberation," as Spottiswoode has it,[2] they came to an Agreement, which was in effect—that the *old polity* should *revive*, and take place; only with some little alterations, which seemed necessary from the change that had been made in religion. Whoso pleases may see it more largely in Calderwood,[3] who tells us that the whole scheme is "registered in the Books of Council;" more briefly, in Spottiswoode and Petrie.[4] In short, it was a constitution much the same with that which we have ever since had in the times of Episcopacy. For, by this Agreement, those who were to have the *old prelatical power* were also to have the *old prelatical names* and *titles* of *Archbishops* and *Bishops* —the *old division* of the *Dioceses* was to take place—the patrimony of the Church was to run much in the *old channel*— particularly, express provision was made concerning *Chapters*, *Abbots*, *Priors*, &c. that they should be continued, and enjoy their *old rights* and *privileges* as Churchmen—and, generally, things were put in a regular course.

This was the *second model* (not a *new* one) of *polity* established in the Church of Scotland after the Reformation, at a pretty good distance, I think, from the rules and exigencies of *parity*. The truth is, both Calderwood and Petrie acknowledge it was *imparity* with a witness! The thing was so manifest, they had not the *brow* to deny it. All their endeavours are only to impugn the authority of this constitution, or raise clouds about it, or find weaknesses

[1] [The persons delegated were the Earl of Morton, Chancellor, Lord Ruthven, Treasurer, the Abbot of Dunfermline, Secretary, Mr James Macgill, Keeper of the Rolls, Sir James Bellenden, Justice-Clerk, and Campbell of Glenorchy, on the part of the Privy Council. For the Reformed Preachers—Erskine of Dun and Winram, Superintendents of Angus and Fife, Mr Andrew Hay, Commissioner of Clydesdale, Mr David Lindesay, Commissioner of the West, Mr Robert Pont, Commissioner of Orkney, and Mr John Craig, Knox's friend, one of the ministers of Edinburgh. Spottiswooode, p. 260.—E.]

[2] Spottiswoode, 260.

[3] Calderwood, 50, &c.

[4] Spottiswoode, 260; Petrie, 273.

in it. So far as I can collect, no man ever affirmed that at this time the *government* of the Church of Scotland was *Presbyterian*, except G[ilbert] R[ule], who is truly singular for his skill in these matters. But we shall have, some time or other, occasion to consider him. In the meantime let us consider Calderwood's and Petrie's pleas against this Establishment. They may be reduced to these four :—

" 1. The incompetency of the authority of the meeting at Leith in January 1571-2.

" 2. The *force* which was at that time put upon the ministers by the *Court*, which would needs have that Establishment take place.

" 3. The limitedness of the power then granted to Bishops.

" 4. The reluctancies which the subsequent Assemblies discovered against that Establishment."

These are the most material *pleas* they insist on, and I shall consider how far they may hold.

1. The first *plea* is, the incompetency of the authority of the meeting at Leith, January 12, 1571-2, which gave commission to the *six* for agreeing with the *State* to such an Establishment. " It is not called an Assembly, but a Convention, in the Register. The ordinary Assembly was not appointed to be holden till the 6th of March thereafter.[1]" —" As it was only a Convention, so it was in very great haste, it seems, and took not time to consider things of such importance, so deliberately as they ought to have been considered.[2]"—" It was a corrupt Convention, for it allowed Mr Robert Pont, *a minister*, to be a Lord of the Session.[3] These are the reasons they insist on to prove the authority of that meeting *incompetent*. And now to examine them briefly.

When I consider these arguments, and for what end they are adduced, I must declare I cannot but admire the *force* of *prejudice* and *partiality*—how much they *blind* men's eyes, and *distort* their reasons, and *bias* them to the most ridiculous undertakings. For, what though the next ordinary Assembly was not appointed to meet till *March* thereafter?

[1] Calderwood, 49 ; Petrie, 372. [2] Calderwood, 50 ; Petrie, 373, 374.
[3] Calderwood, 50 ; Petrie, 375.

Do not even the Presbyterians themselves maintain the *lawfulness*, yea, the *necessity*, of calling General Assemblies extraordinarily—upon extraordinary occasions, *pro re nata*, as they call it! How many such have been called since the Reformation? How much did they insist on this pretence, anno 1638? And what though the Register calls this meeting a Convention? Was it therefore no *Assembly?* Is there such an opposition between the words *convention* and *assembly*, that both cannot possibly signify the same thing? Doth not Calderwood acknowledge that they *voted* themselves an Assembly in their second Session? Doth he not acknowledge that all the ordinary members were there which used to constitute Assemblies? But what if it can be found that an undoubted, uncontroverted Assembly, owned it as an Assembly, and its authority as the authority of an Assembly? What is become of this fine argument then? But can this be done indeed? Yes, it can; and these same very authors have given it in these same very histories,[1] in which they use this as an argument, and not very far from the same very pages. Both of them, I say, tell that the General Assembly holden at Perth, in August immediately thereafter, made an Act which began thus—"*Forasmuch as the Assembly holden in Leith in January last*," &c.

But if it was an Assembly, yet *it was in too great haste!* It did not things deliberately! Why so? no reason is adduced, no reason can be adduced, for saying so. The *subject* they were to treat of was no *new one*. It was a subject that had employed all their heads for several months before. Their great business, at that time, was to give a commission to *some members* to meet with the *delegates* of the *State*, to adjust matters about the polity and patrimony of the Church. This commission was not given till the *third Session*, as Calderwood himself acknowledges.[2] Where, then, was the great *haste?* Lay it in doing a thing in their *third* Session, which might have been done in the *first?*

But were not these commissioners in too great *haste* to come to an *Agreement* when they met with the delegates of the State? Yes, if we may believe Petrie, for he says[1]—"That the same day (viz. January 16) the commissioners

[1] Calderwood, 57; Petrie, 376. [2] Calderwood, 49. [3] Petrie, 353.

convened and concluded," &c. But he may say, with that same integrity, whatever he pleases. For, not to insist on Spottiswoode's account,[1] who says, it was " after divers meetings and long deliberation " that they came to their conclusion—not to insist on his authority, I say, because he may be suspected as partial, doth not Calderwood[2] expressly acknowledge, that they began their conference upon the *sixteenth* of January, and that matters were not *finally* concluded and ended till the *first* of *February*?[3]

But was it not a *corrupt* Convention? Did it not allow *Pont*, a minister, to be a *Lord* of the *Session?* A mighty demonstration, sure, of its corruption! Well! Suppose it was a *corruption*, was it such a *plaguy* one as infected all the *other* acts of that Convention? Is *one* corrupt Act of an Assembly enough to reprobate *all* the rest of its Acts?[4] If so, I think it will fare ill with a good many Assemblies. Whether was it a *corruption* in an Assembly to *oblige* men

[1] Spottiswoode, 260. [2] Calderwood, 50. [3] Ibid. 55.

[4] [In these questions our author alludes to the famous Assembly of 1638, which, because the Bishops would not appear before it, unjustly and absurdly condemned them (among other things) " for *receiving consecration to the office of Episcopacy*, and by virtue of this usurped power, and power of High Commission, pressing the Kirk with novations in the worship of God;" and " in case they acknowledge not this Assembly, reverence not the constitution thereof, and obey not their sentence, nor make repentance according to the order prescribed, ordains them to be excommunicated." Besides the utter inconsistency of Bishops being judged by a body composed of laymen and rebellious Presbyters, it must be remembered that this self-constituted tribunal was illegal. (See the " Declinature " presented to the Assembly by the Bishops, in which the several grounds of its illegality are drawn up in a masterly and comprehensive way.) The Marquis of Hamilton, the Commissioner, had *dissolved* it; but in spite of the royal authority they protested,—" declaring for the freedom of uninterrupted sitting, and that *for his Majesty to countermand was to prejudge the prerogative of Jesus Christ and the liberties of the Kirk!*" It perhaps will not be out of place to subjoin here a list of the charges brought against the Bishops by these disaffected persons, who seem to have searched the catalogue of vice for shafts which they might hurl at the heads of their innocent victims. But in this instance the very atrocity of the calumnies defeated the purpose of their malevolent aspersers. An honest Presbyterian writer, speaking of their proceedings, says —" My heart was truly sorry to see such despiteful and insulting carriage." The Bishops were accused of " *excessive drinking, whoring, playing at cards and dice, swearing, profane speaking, excessive gambling, profaning of the Sabbath, contempt of the public ordinances, and private family-exercises, mocking of the power of preaching, prayer, spiritual conference and sincere professors; besides bribery, simony,*

to *do penance* for *doing* their *duty*—to declare against the *King's negative voice* in Parliament, and so *unking* him, &c.? But to go on. Why should *this* Assembly bear the whole blame of this *corruption*, if it was one? Was it not ratified by a subsequent Assembly? And should not *it* bear its share? Both authors knew this very well, for both of them record it.[1] It was the Assembly holden at Edinburgh, March 6, 1573:—"The Regent craved some learned men of the ministry"—they are Calderwood's *own words*—"to be placed Senators of the College of Justice. The Assembly after reasoning at length, voted, that none was able to bear the said two charges, and therefore inhibited any minister to take upon him to be a Senator of the College of Justice, Master *Robert Pont* only excepted, who was already placed with advice and consent of the Kirk." Petrie gives the

selling of commissaries' places, lies, perjuries, dishonest dealings in civil bargains, abusing of the vassals, adulteries, incests, with many other offences." We can scarcely imagine that even the most fiendish malice, urged on by the demon of party spirit, and by the noise of political and religious excitement, could have believed that aged and reverend prelates were guilty of such monstrous crimes. Yet the zealous disciples and leaders of the Covenant, the loud vaunters of themselves as the professors of the purest religion upon earth and the most loyal subjects of the Prince of peace, did not scruple to employ such engines to excite the animosity of a turbulent and fanatical mob against their ecclesiastical superiors, to blacken their characters, and destroy their usefulness. We might, out of delicacy to human nature, have wished to hide this disgraceful page in the history of Scottish Presbyterianism; but the fact, that this rebellious Assembly was commemorated in 1838, and speeches of a most offensive nature were delivered on the occasion by the "shining lights" of the Kirk, obliges us to unfold some of the enormities by which it was characterized, which ought rather to cause it to be regarded as an object of *national shame* than one *even of party approval*. The commemoration of 1838, however it served local purposes, and bore upon existing strifes, completely identified the *then* dominant party in the Kirk with the acts and opinions of the members of the Glasgow Assembly, and made them "witnesses unto themselves" that they were their genuine descendants; and "if they had been in the days of their fathers, they would have been partakers with them" in their rebellion against their King, and their endeavours to "destroy the innocent." A recent historian paints this Assembly in its true colours, when he says that it "*took no step which was not illegal, pronounced no sentence which was not unjust, manifested no feeling that was not unchristian, and has left even in the record of its proceedings by an enthusiastic member* (Baillie) *a beacon to be avoided by every legal court and ecclesiastical community.*" Life and Times of Montrose by Mark Napier, Esq. p. 65.—E.]

[1] Calderwood, 62; Petrie, 379.

same account, only he ends it thus—"*By advice*," &c. He thought it expedient, it seems, to conceal the mention made *of the Kirk*, and no doubt he did *wisely*, i. e. suitably to his purpose; for Calderwood added it but foolishly, considering that there could not be a clearer acknowledgement of the authority of the Convention at Leith than giving it thus the name of *the Kirk*. But what needs more? If this was a *corruption*, it was *one*, even in the times of Presbytery, after the year 1580; for did not Pont even then continue to be a Lord of the Session? Or will our brethren say that it is a *fault* to *introduce* a corruption, but it is *none* to *continue* it when it is *introduced?* All this is said upon the supposition that it was a corruption, though I am not yet convinced that it was one—at least so great a one as might have given ground for all this stir about it. I doubt, if the members of this Assembly at Leith had been thorough-paced *Parity men*, vigorous for the *good cause*, it should no more have been a corruption in them to have allowed Pont[1] to sit as a Lord of Session, than it was in the

[1] [Pont was born at Culross, Perthshire, in 1529, and having espoused the cause of the Reformation, occupied a conspicuous situation in all the events of that extraordinary epoch of Scottish history. In the year 1563 he competed for the office of Superintendent of the Diocese of Galloway. But failing in this attempt, he was soon after appointed Commissioner of the Diocese of Moray, which office he held till January 1571, when he obtained the Provostry of Trinity College, and afterwards the Vicarage of St Cuthbert's, Edinburgh. In that year, at the command of the Assembly of the Kirk, he excommunicated Bothwell, Bishop of Orkney, for having celebrated the marriage between Mary and the Earl of Bothwell. In 1571, Morton, in order to please the Kirk, proposed that some of its members should be elevated to the vacant judicial dignities formerly held by Churchmen. Accordingly, in January 1572, the General Assembly allowed Pont to accept the place "of ane of the Senators of the College of Justice," or Judge in the Scottish Supreme Court, "providing allwayes that he leave not the office of the ministrie, but that he exercise the same as he sould be appoyntit by the Kirke." It seems, however, that his judicial appointment caused him to neglect his clerical duties, as in the General Assembly which met at Edinburgh, August 1573, he was accused of non-residence, and not visiting the parish churches in the Diocese of Moray. He admitted the charge, pleading "want of leisure." "No wonder," says his Presbyterian friend Calderwood sarcastically, "he was suffered to be a Senator of the College of Justice." In 1574, Pont was appointed colleague to William Harlaw, minister of St Cuthbert's parish, Edinburgh, thus modestly uniting *three offices* in his own person! In 1582 he was invited to become minister of St Andrews, which *call* he seems to have accepted; but he relinquished that appointment after holding it one

Kirk once upon a day to allow *Mr Alexander Henderson*[1] to sit as a member of *Committee*, you know for what.

year; for in the General Assembly held in April 1583, he talked of having served in St Andrews at his "awin charges ane haill year, with losse of his heritage and warldlie commoditie, and culd not haif any equall condition of leving, na, not the least provision." He in consequence returned to his old charge of St Cuthbert's; but it is probable that his reluctance to resign his appointment in the Court of Session, was the *real* cause of his complaint, and *the loss* which he was afraid of sustaining. In 1584, when James VI. issued a proclamation, rendering it criminal for the Presbyterian preachers to decline the jurisdiction of the Privy Council, and hold General Assemblies without the royal permission, Pont had the boldness to join the recusants, by protesting against the Acts when they were published at the Cross of Edinburgh, on the pretence that they had been passed without the consent of that *imperium in imperio*, the General Assembly. This was on the 25th of May, yet two days before he had been deprived of his seat on the Bench, by an Act prohibiting persons of his profession from holding such offices. He fled to England with a number of the preachers, who justly dreaded the resentment of the King. But his stay there was short, for we find that he returned to Scotland a few months afterwards with the Earl of Angus and his party, and was allowed to resume his ministerial functions. He subsequently contrived to make his peace with the Court, for in 1587, James VI. nominated him to be Titular Bishop of Caithness, which he was prevented from accepting. In 1596 and 1602, he was chosen Commissioner for Orkney, and his name was again first on the list of those who were intended for the Titular Bishopricks. Pont was the author of several treatises on various subjects, and the father of Timothy Pont, the celebrated Scottish geographer. He died in May 1608, in the 81st year of his age, and was interred in the church-yard of St Cuthbert's, where a monument was erected to his memory, having an inscription, partly in questionable Latin and doggerel English rhyme, in which he is designated *Sir* Robert Pont. For a list of his Works see M'Crie's Life of Andrew Melville, vol. ii. p. 315, and Tytler's Life of Sir Thomas Craig of Riccarton, p. 219, 228.—E.]

[1] [Henderson at the outset of life was an advocate for Episcopacy, and through the favour of his friend and patron Archbishop Gladstanes became minister of Leuchars, a parish in Fife near St Andrews; but having been neglected by Spottiswoode, the successor of Gladstanes, his proud and presumptuous spirit was galled by disappointment (vide Aiton's Life and Times of Alexander Henderson, p. 92), and this very probably paved the way for the change of sentiment which he soon after exhibited by opposing the "Articles of Perth," and finally becoming one of the most violent enemies of Episcopacy. The quietness of Leuchars was ill fitted to one of his turbulent disposition, and he soon exchanged his pastoral duties for more congenial employment. We find him at one period a member of (what even a candid Presbyterian writer has characterized as) the "despotic tribunal" of the "Tables;" then a zealous champion of the National Assembly; and in his capacity as an "apostle" of the Covenant passing through an assigned district of Scotland, for the purpose of procuring subscriptions to it. At another time he is sitting in the Moderator's

And so much for the last plea. Proceed we, 2. To the "*force* the *Court* at that time put upon the clergy to accept

chair at the Glasgow Assembly; then a delegate to the Westminster Assembly; and a framer and promoter of the Solemn League and Covenant which was the result of that singular conference. In short, he was a constant actor in every scene of those stirring times, and a prime instigator to most of the illegal acts which mark the rise and progress of the grand Rebellion. But it is not easy to determine the event in his life to which our author here refers. It was evidently one in which he united both the *civil* and *ecclesiastical* character in his own person—most probably that alluded to by Granger, who says—"He was sent into England in the double capacity of a *divine* and a *plenipotentiary*; he knew how to rouse the people to war, or negotiate a peace." Granger's Biographical History of England, London, 1824, vol. ii. p. 377, 378. Perhaps the most extraordinary occupation in which Henderson was ever engaged, was the duty assigned him by the Westminster Assembly, of persuading Charles I. to take the Covenant, and to abolish Episcopacy in England, as he had been compelled to do in Scotland. It need not be added, that after a long controversy carried on by mutual consent in writing, the arguments of the Covenanting preacher were unsuccessful, and the Monarch, whose defence of his principles is highly creditable to his character as a theologian, remained "steadfast in the Faith," and as firmly attached as ever to the Apostolic order which he was required to renounce and destroy. In connexion with this, it may be interesting to record a curious testimony, preserved by Bishop Sage in another place, of the altered sentiments on various subjects entertained by Henderson just before his death, which occurred soon after his controversy with the King. This fact, so far from being a blot on his memory, is highly creditable, as it shews him not to have been altogether devoid of principle, and blinded by prejudice. It is this, that on his death-bed, before three friends who had come to visit him, Henderson expressed his deep regret for the part he had acted in the public commotions of his day—"taking God to witness that he proposed nothing when he began, but the security of religion and the Kirk, in opposition to Popery, which, he was made to believe, was at the bottom of the King's designs, but now he was sensible all his fears were groundless. He had conversed frequently with the King, and was fully satisfied that he was as sincere a Protestant as was in all his dominions; for which reason he gave them his advice, as from a dying man, that they should break off in time, for they had all gone too far already, and nothing now was so proper for them as to retreat, and return to their duty to his Majesty, who was the most learned, the most candid and conscientious, the most religious, and every way the best King that ever did sit upon a throne in Britain. One of the brethren present not relishing his discourse, insinuated that he was in a high fever and raving, and that therefore no heed should be taken of what he said. But he, overhearing the remark, repeated his words, and assured his friends that he was not raving, but had the use of his reason as much as ever, and therefore desired them in the name of God to believe that what he spake was from his heart, and with all the sincerity and seriousness that became a dying person." This is the substance of "Henderson's Confession," which Bishop Sage declares he got from Mr

of that establishment." Calderwood is mighty on this *plea*:—"The Superintendent of Angus"—(who had a principal hand in the Agreement at Leith)—"a man too tractable, might easily be induced by his chief, the Earl of Mar, Regent for the time, to condescend to the heads and articles of this book."[1] And, "It was easy to the Court to obtain the consent of many ministers to this sort of Episcopacy.—Some being poor, some being covetous and ambitious, some

Robert Freebairn, minister of Gask and Archdeacon of Dunblane, who had it from his father, one of the persons who visited Henderson on his death-bed, and heard the confession from his own lips. Of course, different persons, according to their prejudices, will receive this testimony with greater or less authority, and some will reject it entirely; but there seems to be no reason to doubt its accuracy, coming, as it does, from so respectable a source. One thing is certain, that it was not an invention of Mr Freebairn, for a similar report was generally current soon after the death of Henderson. See Gillan's Life of Sage, p. 72-74; and the devout and learned Bishop Hickes, in a book called "Ravillac Redivivus," mentions the fact of Henderson's repentance, and the suspicion with which his friends the Covenanters were wont to regard their fallen saint towards the close of his life. Some of his ardent admirers, however, would not be persuaded of anything prejudicial to the character of one whom they considered so renowned, and in order to perpetuate his memory, they erected a monument to him in the Grey-friars churchyard, Edinburgh, emblazoned with the Solemn League and Covenant. But the Government, after the Restoration, was not so sensible of any particular benefit which either the State or the Church had received from this person's services, and in the day of "retaliation," an order was issued by the Parliament that the monument should be defaced, which was faithfully executed.—E.]

[1] Calderwood, 55.—[Without presuming to determine what degree of influence the regent possessed over his humbler relative, and how this was exerted to get him to agree to the Articles of Leith, we may subjoin Erskine's own opinion upon a subject which formed a main topic in the Leith agreement, and is the point of difference between our author and his opponents. It will at least shew that Calderwood's hypothesis about the Regent's influence was quite unnecessary. In a letter from the Superintendent of Angus to his relative and "Chief," the Earl of Mar, dated Montrose, November 10, 1571, after citing the texts 1 Tim. v. 22, and 2 Tim. ii. 2, as comments upon the Episcopal office, it is thus written—"To the office of a Bishop pertains examination and admission into spiritual cure and office, and also to oversee them that are admitted, that they walk uprightly, and exercise their office faithfully and purely. To take this power from the Bischop and Superintendent is to take away the office of a Bischop, that no Bischop be in the Kirk, WHICH WERE *to alter and abolish the order that God has appointed in His Kirk*."—Bannatyne's Memorials, p. 198. It is pretty clear that the man who *held such opinions* did not require much *external influence* to induce him to assent to that enactment of the Leith Convention which related to Episcopacy.—E.]

not taking up the gross corruption of the office, some having a carnal respect to some Noblemen their friends.[1]" And how often doth he impute it all to the Earl of Morton? And Calderwood's faithful follower G[ilbert] R[ule], in his "First Vindication," &c. tells us, that "the Convention of Churchmen met at Leith was too much influenced by the Court."[2] Now, for answer to all this, in the first place, what if one should allow all that is alleged? Will it follow from that allowance that *Prelacy* was not then agreed to? The question is not, how it was done, but if it was done? For if it was done, it is an argument that the clergy then thought little on the *indispensibility* of *parity;* or that they were very bad men, who, though they believed that indispensibility, did yet agree to Prelacy. It is true, indeed, Calderwood makes them here every whit as bad as that could amount to. He makes them a pack of poor, covetous, ambitious, ignorant, carnal rogues, who were thus *Court-ridden.* But behold the *difference between market-days*, as we say. The same author, when he comes afterward to tell who were appointed to compile the Second Book of Discipline, a task agreeable to his temper, gives the same men who were commissioners at the Agreement at Leith—for they were generally nominated[3] for that work—a far different character—"Our Kirk hath not had worthier men since, nor of better gifts."[4] This might be enough, yet I will proceed further, because what I have to say may be useful for coming by a just sense of the state of affairs in these times. I say, therefore, that all this *plea* is mere groundless *noise* and *fiction.* The Court had no imaginable reason for pressing this establishment which was not as proper for the clergy to have insisted on, and the clergy had one reason more than the Court could pretend to.

The great reasons the Court could *then* insist on—what else could they be than that *Episcopacy* stood still established by *law?*—that according to the fundamental constitution, which had obtained time out of mind, the ecclesiastics had made *one* of the *Three Estates* of Parliament—that such an essential alteration in the civil constitution as

[1] Calderwood, 56. [2] P. 7.
[3] [The only exception was a Mr William Lundie.—E.]
[4] Calderwood, 73.

behoved necessarily to result from the want of that *Estate*, being the *First* of the *Three*, was infinitely dangerous at any time, as tending to turn the whole Constitution loose, and shake the very foundations of the Government—that it tended to the subversion of the High Court of Parliament, and naturally and necessarily inferred essential nullities in all the meetings the other *two Estates* could have, and all the Acts they could make—that it was more dangerous at that time, during the King's minority, to have the Constitution so disjointed, than on other occasions—that whosoever was Regent, or whosoever were his counsellors, might be called to an account for it, when the King came to perfect age—and it was obvious that it might easily be found *high treason* in them, that they had suffered such *alterations*—that the best way to preserve the rights of the Church, and *put* her and *keep* her in her possession of her patrimony, was to *preserve* that *Estate*—that the best way to *preserve* that Estate was to *continue* it in the old, tried, wisely digested, and long approven constitution of it. What other arguments, I say, than these, or such as were like them, can we conceive the Court could then make use to persuade the clergy to agree to the *old polity?* Is it to be imagined they turned *theologues*, and endeavoured to indoctrinate the clergy, and convince them from Scripture, and antiquity, and ecclesiastical history, &c., that Episcopacy was of Divine institution, or the best, or a lawful government, of the Church? If I mistake not, such topics in these times were not much thought on by our statesmen. But if they were such arguments as I have given a specimen of, which they insisted on, as no doubt they were, if they insisted on any, then I would fain know which of them it was that might not have been as readily insisted on by the clergy as by the statesmen. Nay, considering that there were no scruples of conscience then, concerning the *lawfulness* of such a Constitution, how reasonable is it to think that the clergy might be as forward as the statesmen could be to insist on these arguments, especially if it be further considered, that besides these and the like arguments, the clergy had one very considerable argument to move them for the re-establishment of the *old constitution*, which was, that they had found by experience that the *new scheme* fallen upon in the "First Book of

Discipline" had done much hurt to the Church, as I have already observed—that by forsaking the *old* constitution the Church had suffered too much already—and that it was high time for them now to return to their *old fond*, considering at what losses they had been since they had deserted it? And all this will appear more reasonable and credible still, if two things more be duly considered.

The first is, that the *six* clergymen who were commissioned by the Assembly on this occasion to treat with the *State* were all sensible men—men who understood the constitution both of Church and State, had *heads* to *comprehend* the consequences of things, and were very far from being *Parity-men*. The second is, the *oddness* (to call it no worse) of the reason which our authors feign to have been the motive which made the Court at that time so earnest for such an establishment, namely, that thereby "they might gripe at the commodity" (as Calderwood[1] words it)—that is, pos-

[1] Calderwood, 55.—[This cause for the institution of Episcopacy by the Convention of Leith, is much insisted on by Presbyterian writers, but if it serves to account for the willingness with which the Nobles and other laymen acceded to the change, how does it explain the conduct of the *ministers*—of whom Calderwood asserts "that our Kirk had not *worthier* men, nor of better gifts"—who proposed such a nefarious plan of alienating the patrimony of the Church, and thus injuring their own interests? Indeed, with regard to the Nobles, allowing them to have been as sordid and rapacious as possible, it is almost incredible that they should have devised such a plan for appropriating to themselves the revenues of the Sees. Would it not have been much easier for them to have compassed their ends while the Sees were vacant, and the revenues had no lawful owners, than by creating occupants for them, and giving them a legal title to the possessions of the Church? In the one case, with their powerful influence, the key of the ecclesiastical coffers was in *their own hands*, but by resigning it into the hands even of their relatives and dependents, they ran the risk of defrauding themselves; for how could they be assured that, when these persons felt themselves secure in their situations of emolument, they would become pliant tools for *their* purposes, and quietly disgorge the wealth into *their* bosoms, by whom they had been selfishly promoted? Was it not to be suspected that those, whom their influence had advanced, might, when flushed with the tenure of their ill-gotten prosperity, turn round upon their avaricious patrons, and find excuses for justifying the non-fulfilment of an unjust compact? It argues a partial acquaintance with human nature either not to foresee that such an issue was likely to occur, or to believe that crafty and sordid statesmen would have trammelled themselves with such dangerous uncertainties, when the way to obtain their desires was previously open before them. Besides, even if it be credited that they could have been so foolish

sess themselves of the Church's patrimony. What? Had the clergy so suddenly fallen from their daily, their constant,

as to create Bishops for the purpose of getting, *through them*, at the property of the Church by means of simoniacal pactions, and that there was no danger of their creatures playing them false after their elevation, it is to be remembered that no private compacts between a patron and incumbent could permanently alienate the ecclesiastical dues. So that besides the temptation to human honesty, they perilled their hopes of gain upon the uncertainty of human life also. Thus the hypothesis that the Leith Agreement was brought about by the influence of the Nobles for unworthy ends, is utterly untenable upon every recognized principle of action. It is not a little surprising that many Episcopal writers have unconsciously followed in the wake of the enemy, and allowed this cause for the then institution of Episcopacy to pass unchallenged. Besides being untrue, in admitting it we throw away a proof of the Episcopal opinions of the preachers of that day—(although one would think, that by their receiving any thing in the form of Bishops as an ecclesiastical system, if they are to be considered as honest men, their opinions are sufficiently indicated)—and of the lateness of the origin of Parity in Scotland. In fact, this change in ecclesiastical affairs in 1571-2 arose from the *ministers* themselves, who devised it for their own protection, and it was promoted by those at the head of the Government in Scotland for the *security of the kingdom*. The immediate cause of it was the Act of the Parliament at Stirling, in August 1571, quoted by our author page 223, which was assigned to give the sanction of law to the spoliation of the Church's possessions by the Nobles, who had hitherto detained them "by connivance or force." Ibid. This alarmed the ministers, as calculated to deprive them of the possibility of ever obtaining their rights. Fortunately the Assembly was sitting at the same time at Stirling, and having received a letter from Knox, whose illness prevented him from being present, apprising them of what was going on, and warning them, "as they would not be thought unfaithful to the Lord Jesus, to gainstand these merciless devourers of the patrimonie of the Kirk"—Bannatyne's Memorials, p. 103, they "bethought themselves if possibly a stop could be put to such notorious robbery" before it should become *law*, and delegated certain of their number to go to the Regent and Estates of Parliament, "humbly to desire and request *in the* NAME OF THE KIRK, the granting of such heads and articles, and redressing of such complaints, as should be GIVEN TO THEM BY THE KIRK." The result of this petition and the subsequent deliberations of the Committee upon it, was the Agreement of Leith. It is clear, therefore, from these incontrovertible facts, that this plan was concerted by the *ministers themselves*, and proposed to the Government, with a view of averting the danger with which the temporalities of the Church were threatened by the enactment of the Parliament at Stirling. As for the reason which induced the Regent Mar and his colleagues to accept and carry it out—that it was the same, which our author so lucidly states, (indeed it is difficult to assign any other sound one), viz. to preserve the constitution entire, is the opinion of the most candid of Presbyterian historians, the learned Professor of Moral Philosophy in St Andrews. "At the

their continual *claim* to the revenues of the Church? Had they in an instant altered their sentiments about *sacrilege*, and things consecrated to holy uses? Were they now willing to part with the Church's *patrimony?* Did that which moved them to be so earnest for this meeting with the State miraculously slip out of their minds, so that they inconcernedly quitted their pretensions, and betrayed their own interests? Were they all fast asleep when they were at the Conference—so much asleep, or senseless, that they could not perceive the Court intended them such a *trick?* On the other hand, if the Court had such a design as is pretended, I must confess I do not see how it was useful for them, to fall on such a wild project for accomplishing their purposes. Why be at all this pains to re-establish the *old* polity, if the

Reformation," says Dr Cook, "it was esteemed dangerous to make any great innovation upon the political constitution then existing; and although the Roman Catholic Bishops were prohibited from teaching, and were, in fact, deprived of their right to exercise their clerical functions, they were permitted to retain the privilege of sitting in Parliament, and many of them regularly attended its deliberations. In progress of time several of them died, and as there was no possibility of continuing the Succession, the Sees remained permanently vacant, and there was a near prospect of the total extinction of the Spiritual branch of the Legislature. The persons who successively administered the government of James contemplated with much anxiety and alarm an event which might be attended with consequences fatal to the throne of their Sovereign. They dreaded that if under the reign of a minor one of the Estates ceased to exist, their proceedings might be afterwards declared illegal, and the whole of those interesting regulations by which the liberty and the religion of the great mass of the people were intended to be secured, might be destroyed." History of the Church of Scotland, vol. i. p. 167-8. Thus it appears that this famous change was devised and effected by the joint concurrence of the preachers and heads of the Government for palpable and substantial purposes. In the whole matter the Nobles, as a body, seem to have been quiescent. But it is not denied that, when the constitution *was* established, and they became anxious for the security of the wealth which they had plundered from the Church, the Nobles *did* use the influence to get their creatures appointed to the Sees. It was the only expedient which remained to them; and the Earl of Morton, who had secretly urged on the inhuman execution of Archbishop Hamilton, in order that he might obtain from the Regent a grant of the rich temporalities of the See of St Andrews, when he found that a successor was to be created in his place, strenuously exerted himself to procure the appointment for a relation of his own, with the view, it was said, of participating with him in the revenues, which he foresaw would have to be restored. His example may have been followed by others, and very probably persons were found wicked enough to enter into such infamous transactions. Perhaps the occurrence of some such flagrant cases gave rise to the sobriquet of *tulchan*, which has been applied to

only purpose was to *rob* the Church of her patrimony? Might not that have been done without as well as with it? Could they have wished the Church in weaker circumstances for asserting her own rights than she was in before this Agreement? Was it not as easy to have possessed themselves of a Bishopric, an Abbacy, a Priory, &c., when there were no Bishops, nor Abbots, nor Priors, as when there were? What a pitiful politic, or rather what an insolent wickedness, was it, as it were, to take a coat which was no man's, and put on one, and possess him of it, and call it his coat, that they might rob him of it? Or, making the uncharitable supposition that they could have ventured on such a needless—such a *mad fetch* of iniquity, were all the clergy so short-sighted that they could not penetrate into such a palpable, such a *gross* piece of *cheatery?* But what needs more? It is certain that by that Agreement the Church's patrimony was fairly secured to her, and she was put in far better condition than she was ever in before since the Reformation. Let any man read over Calderwood's account of the Agreement, and he must confess it. And yet perhaps the account may be more full and clear in the Books of Council, if they be extant.

It is true, indeed, the courtiers afterwards played their *tricks*, and *robbed* the Church, and it cannot be denied that they got some bad clergymen who were subservient to their purposes. But this was so far from being pretended to be *aimed* at by these courtiers while the Agreement was a-making—it was so far from these clergymen's minds who adjusted matters at that time with the laity (these courtiers) to give them the smallest advantages that way—to allow them the least scope for such encroachments, that, on the contrary, when afterwards they found the Nobility were taking such methods, and plundering the Church, they complained mightily of it, as a manifest breach of the Agreement, and

those Titulars—*tulchan* meaning a calf's skin stuffed with straw, in order to make the cow let down her milk. But however this may be, such compacts were quite opposed to the regulations made at Leith, and the solemn oaths "against simony and dilapidation of benefices" which the Convention required the Bishops to take at their inauguration, and whenever they were suspected or discovered, the Ecclesiastical authorities sifted them closely, and visited with severe and merited punishment those persons who were found guilty of forming them.—E.]

an horrid iniquity. But, whatever truth is in all this reasoning I have spent on this point, is not much material to my main purpose. For whether at that time Episcopacy was imposed upon the Church or not, or, if imposed, whether it was out of a bad design or not, affects not in the least the principal controversy. For however it was, it is certain the Church accepted of it at that time, which we are bound in charity to think a sufficient argument that she was not then of *Anti-Prelatical* principles. She had no such Article in her Creed as the *Divine Right of Parity*, which is the great point I am concerned for in all this tedious controversy.

3. The third *Plea* is the "limitedness of the power which was then granted to Bishops." They had no more power granted them by this establishment than Superintendents had enjoyed before! This all my authors insist upon with great earnestness,[1] and I confess it is very true. This was provided for both by the Agreement at Leith, and by an Act of the Assembly holden at Edinburgh 1574. But then, 1. If they had the *same power* which Superintendents had before, I think they had truly *Prelatic power;* they did not act in *parity* with other ministers. 2. Though they had no more *power*, yet it is certain they had more *privilege*. They were not answerable to their own *Synods*, but only to *General Assemblies*, as is clear even from Calderwood's own account of the Agreement at Leith.[2] In that point the absurd constitution in the "First Book of Discipline" was altered. 3. One thing more I cannot but observe here concerning Mr Calderwood. This *judicious* historian, when he was concerned to *raise dust* about the *Prelacy* of *Superintendents*, found easily seven or eight *huge* differences between *Superintendents* and *Bishops*. And now that he is concerned to *raise dust* about the *Prelacy* of Bishops, he thinks he has gained a great point if he makes it the same with the *Prelacy* of Superintendents. What a mercy was it that ever poor Prelacy out lived the *dint* of such *doughty* onsets? But it seems it must be a *tough-lived* thing, and cannot be easily chased out of its nature.

[1] Calderwood, 51, 55, 56, 66; Petrie, 374, 383; G[ilbert] R[ule]'s First Vindication, p. 8. [2] Calderwood, 51.

There is another considerable thrust made at it by Calderwood and his disciple G[ilbert] R[ule],[1] which may come in as a *succedaneum* to the former argument. What is it? It is even that in the General Assembly at Edinburgh, March 6, 1573, *David Ferguson* was "chosen Moderator, who was neither Bishop nor Superintendent." And so down falls *Prelacy!* But so was honest *George Buchanan*, in the Assembly holden in July 1567, who was neither *Superintendent*, *Bishop*, nor *Presbyter*, and so down falls *Presbytery!* Nay, down falls the whole ministry! Is not this a hard *lock* Prelacy is brought to, that it shall not be itself, so long as one wrong step can be found to have been made by a *Scottish General Assembly*?

I have adduced and discussed all these pleas, not that I thought my cause in any hazard by them, but to let the world see what a party one has to deal with in this controversy. Whatever it be, sense or nonsense, if their cause requires it, they must not want an argument. But to go on.

4. But the *fourth* and greatest *Plea* is, that "this Episcopacy was never owned by the Church, it was never allowed by the General Assembly;[2] it was only tolerated for three or four years;[3] it was protested against as a corruption.[4] As these Articles were concluded without the knowledge of the Assembly, so the whole Assembly opposed them earnestly.[5] They were obtruded upon the Church against her will.[6] The Church from the beginning of the Reformation opposed that kind of Bishops.[7] The Church did only for a time yield to civil authority, yet so that she would endeavour to be free of these Articles."[8] These and many more such things are boldly and confidently asserted by Calderwood, Petrie, and the *strenuous Vindicator* of the Church of Scotland, who seldom misses of saying what Calderwood had said before him, and I shall grant they are all said to purpose if they are true; but how far they are from being that, may sufficiently appear, I hope, if I can make these things evident:—

[1] Calderwood, 61; G[ilbert] R[ule]'s First Vindication, 7.
[2] Calderwood, 56; Petrie, 389; G[ilbert] R[ule]'s First Vindication, 7.
[3] Calderwood, 56. [4] Calderwood, 58; G[ilbert R[ule], 7.
[5] Petrie, 376. [6] P. 383. [7] P. 387. [8] P. 376.

1. That the Agreement at Leith was fairly and frequently allowed, approven, and insisted on, by many subsequent Assemblies.

2. That after Episcopacy was questioned, and a party appeared against it, it cost them much struggling and much time before they could get it abolished.

1. I say the *Agreement* at Leith was fairly and frequently allowed, approven, and insisted on, by many subsequent Assemblies. This assertion cannot but appear true to any unbiassed judgment that shall consider but these two things:

1. That in every Assembly for several years after that Establishment, or *Agreement*, or Settlement at Leith, Bishops were present, and sat and voted as such; and, as such, were obliged to be present, and sit, and vote, &c. as both Calderwood and Petrie acknowledge, and shall be made appear by and by.

2. That these two authors have been at special pains to let the world know how punctually they were tried, and sometimes rebuked and censured, for not discharging their offices, as they ought to have done. Both authors, I say, have been very intent and careful to represent this in their accounts of the subsequent Assemblies. I know their purpose herein was to expose the Bishops, and cast all the *dirt* they could upon Episcopacy. But then, as I take it, their pains that way have *luckily* furnished me with a plain demonstration of the falsehood of all they have said in this *plea* I am now considering. For would these Assemblies have suffered them to be *present*, and *sit*, and *vote* as *Bishops?* Would they have *tried* and *censured* them as *Bishops*— would they have put them to their *duty* as *Bishops*, if they had not *owned* them for Bishops? And was there any other *fond* for owning them for Bishops at that time except the *Agreement* at Leith? This alone might be sufficient, I say, for dispatching this whole plea.

Yet, 3. to put this matter beyond all possibility of ever being, with the least colour of probability, controverted hereafter, I recommend to the reader's consideration the following series of Acts made by subsequent Assemblies. The Agreement at Leith, as was observed before, was concluded on the *first* day of *February*, anno 1571-2. The ordinary Assembly met at St Andrews on the *sixth* of March there-

after. The Archbishop of St Andrews[1] (newly advanced to that See by the *Leith* Agreement) *was present*, and "the first person named"—as Calderwood himself hath it[2]—"to be of the Committee that was appointed for revising the Articles agreed upon at Leith;" and an Act was made in that Assembly (as it is both in the MSS. and Petrie[3]) "ordaining the Superintendent of Fife to use his own jurisdiction as before in the provinces not subject to the *Archbishop of St Andrews*, and requesting him to concur with the said Archbishop in his visitations, or otherwise, when he required him, until the next Assembly.—And in like manner the *Superintendents of Angus and Lothian*, without prejudice of the said Archbishop, except by virtue of his commission." By the Assembly holden at Perth, August 6, 1572, this Act was made—"Forasmuch as in the ASSEMBLY *(not the Convention)* of the Church holden at Leith in *January* last, certain commissioners were appointed to deal with the Nobility and their commissioners, to reason and conclude upon diverse Articles and Heads thought good then to be conferred upon, according to which commission they have proceeded in sundry Conventions"—(is this consistent with Petrie's assertion that the same day they met and concluded?)—"and have concluded for that time upon the Heads and Articles, as the same produced in this Assembly proport. In which, being considered, are found certain names, as *Archbishop*, *Dean*, *Archdeacon*, *Chancellor*, *Chapter*, which names are thought slanderous and offensive in the ears of many of the brethren, appearing to *sound* towards Papistry. Therefore the whole Assembly, in one voice, as well they who were in commission at *Leith*, as others, solemnly protest that they mean not, by using such names, to ratify, consent, or agree to any kind of *Papistry* or *superstition*, wishing rather the said *names* to be changed into other *names* that are not *scandalous* and *offensive;* and in like manner they *protest* that the said Heads and Articles agreed upon be only received as an *interim*, until farther and more perfect order be obtained at the hands of the King's

[1] [John Douglas, a cadet of the Earl of Morton's Family, and advanced by his powerful influence to be a Titular.—E.]

[2] Calderwood, 56. [3] Petrie, 375.

Majesty's Regent and Nobility; for the which they will press, as occasion shall serve. Unto the which *protestation* the whole Assembly, in one voice, adhere." So the MSS., Spottiswoode, Calderwood, Petrie.[1] This is the Act on which Calderwood, Petrie, and G[ilbert] R[ule], found their assertion that Episcopacy, *as agreed to at Leith*, was *protested* against, and earnestly opposed by a General Assembly, but with what shadow of reason let any man consider. For, what can be more plain than that they *receive* the substance of the Articles, and only *protest* against the scandalousness of the names used in them? What reason they had for that, besides the over-zealous principle I mentioned before, let the curious inquire. That is none of my present business.

But "they protest that they receive these Articles only for an *interim*." True, but how doth it appear that they received them only for an *interim* out of a dislike to Episcopacy? Had they believed the *Divine right* of *parity*, how could they have received them so much as for an *interim?* How could they have received them at all? The truth is, there were many things in the Articles which required amendment, even though the General Assembly had believed the *Divine right* of Episcopacy; and that they did not receive them for an *interim*, upon the account of any *dislike* they had to Episcopacy, shall be made evident by and by. In the meantime we have gained one point—even *that they were received by this Assembly*, unless *receiving* for an *interim* be not *receiving;* but if they were *received*, I hope it is not *true* that *they were never allowed by a General Assembly;* and if Episcopacy was not *protested* against *at all*, and if there was no such word or phrase in the Act as had the least tendency to import that they judged it a *corruption*, I hope it may consist well enough with the laws of civility to say that G[ilbert] R[ule] was talking *without book*, when he said —"It was protested against as a corruption" by this General Assembly. I doubt, if he had found any of the Prelatists talking with so *much* confidence where they had so *little* ground, he would have been at his beloved lies and calumnies. But enough of this, proceed we in our series.

"By the universal order"—so it is worded in the MSS.,

[1] Spottiswoode, 260; Calderwood, 57; Petrie, 376.

" of the General Assembly holden at Edinburgh, March 6, 1572-3, it was statuted and ordained, that all Bishops, Superintendents, &c. present themselves in every General Assembly that hereafter shall be holden, the first day of the Assembly before noon," &c.[1] Again—" It is thought most reasonable and expedient that Bishops, &c. purchase general letters without any delay, commanding all men to frequent preaching and prayers according to the order received in the congregations," &c.[2] In the Assembly holden at Edinburgh, August 6, 1573—" The Visitation Books of Bishops, &c. were produced, and certain ministers appointed to examine their diligence in visitation."[3] In that same Assembly, Paton, Bishop of Dunkeld, was accused that he had accepted the *name*, but had not *exercised* the *office*, of a *Bishop*, not having proceeded against Papists within his bounds. He was also suspected of simony and perjury, in that, contrary to his oath at the receiving of the Bishoprick, he gave acquittances, and the Earl of Argyll received the profits.[4] If these things were true, he was a *foolish* as well as a *bad* Bishop; but, then, it was evident that this Assembly fairly owned Episcopacy. Further, that by the Agreement at Leith express provisions were made against simony and dilapidation of benefices, and that Bishops should swear to that purpose, &c.—which, I think, is not well consistent with the plea insisted on before, viz. that the Agreement at Leith was forced on the clergy by the Court, out of a design it had upon the revenues of the Church.

I find these further Acts made by this Assembly in the MSS.—" Touching them that receive excommunicates, the whole Kirk, presently assembled, ordains all Bishops, &c. to proceed to excommunication against all receivers of excommunicate persons, if after due admonition the receivers rebel and be disobedient."—" The Kirk ordains all Bishops, &c., in their Synodal conventions, to take a list of the names of the excommunicates within their jurisdictions, and bring them to the General Assemblies, to be published to other Bishops and Superintendents, &c. That they, by their ministers in their provinces,

[1] MSS. Petrie, 379. [2] MSS. Petrie, Ibid.
[3] MSS. Petrie, Ibid. [4] Petrie, Ibid.

may divulgate the same in the whole countries where excommunicates haunt."—"The Kirk, presently assembled, ordains all Bishops and Superintendents, &c. to convene before them all such persons as shall be found suspected of consulting with witches, and, finding them guilty, to cause them public repentance," &c.—"That uniformity may be observed in processes of excommunication, it is ordained that Bishops and Superintendents, &c., shall direct their letters to ministers, where the persons that are to be excommunicated dwell, commanding the said ministers to admonish accordingly, and in case of disobedience to proceed to excommunication, and pronounce the sentence thereof upon a Sunday in time of preaching; and thereafter the ministers to indorse the said letters, making mention of the days of their admonitions and excommunication for disobedience aforesaid, and to report to the said Bishops, &c. according to the direction contained in the said letters."

Petrie[1] has the substance of most of these Acts, but has been at pains to *obscure* them. And no wonder: for here are so many *branches* of *true Episcopal power* established in the persons of these Bishops, that it could not but have appeared very strange that a General Assembly should have conferred them on them, if there was such an aversion then to the order as he and his fellows are willing to have the world believe there was. But honest Calderwood was wiser, for he hath not so much as an intimation of any one of them. And Calderwood having thus concealed them, nay, generally all alongst, whatever might make against his cause as much as he could, what wonder if G[ilbert] R[ule], who knows nothing in the matter but what Calderwood told him, stumbled upon such a notable piece of ignorance in his "First Vindication," as to tell the world that—"Nothing was restored at Leith but the image of Prelacy; that these Tulchan Bishops had only the name of Bishops, while Noblemen and others had the revenue, and the Church all the power?" Nay, that notwithstanding of all was done at Leith—"the real exercise of Presbytery, in all its meetings, lesser or greater, continued and was allowed." But of this more hereafter.

The Assembly holden at Edinburgh, March 6, 1574,

[1] Petrie, 380.

—" concluded concerning the jurisdiction of Bishops in their ecclesiastical function, that it should not exceed the jurisdiction of Superintendents, which heretofore they have had and presently have ; and that they should be subject to the discipline of the General Assembly as members thereof, as Superintendents had been heretofore in all sorts." And, again, this Assembly ordains—" That no Bishop give collation of any benefice within the bounds of Superintendents within his Diocese without their consent and testimonials, subscribed with their hands ; and that Bishops within their Dioceses visit by themselves where no Superintendent is, and give no collation of benefices without the consent of three well qualified ministers."

Here, indeed, both Calderwood and Petrie[1] appear briskly, and transcribe the MSS. word for word. Here was something like limiting the power of the Bishops, and that was an opportunity not to be omitted. But, as I take it, there was no very great reason for this *triumph*, if the true reason of these Acts be considered, as it may be collected from Spottiswoode and Petrie,[2] which was this :—

The Earl of Morton, then Regent, and sordidly covetous, had flattered the Church out of their possession of the thirds of the benefices, the only sure *stock* they could as yet *claim* by any law made since the reformation of religion, promising instead thereof localled stipends upon the ministers ; but having once obtained his end, which was to have the thirds at his disposal, he forgot his promise, and the ministers found themselves miserably tricked. Three or four churches were cast together, and committed to the care of one minister, and a farthing to live by could not be got without vast attendance, trouble, and importunity. Besides, the Superintendents, who had had a principal hand in the Reformation, and were men of great repute, and had spent liberally of their own estates in the service of the Church, were as ill treated as any body ; for when they sought their wonted allowances, they were told there was no more use for them—Bishops were now restored—it was *their* province to govern the Church—Superintendents were now superfluous and unnecessary. The Superintendents thus maltreated, what

[1] Calderwood, 66 ; Petrie, 383. [2] Spottiswoode, 272 ; Petrie, 383.

wonder was it if they had their own resentments of it? So, when the General Assembly met, Erskine, Spottiswoode, and Winram, three of them (and by that time, it is probable, there were no more of them alive) came to the Assembly, offered to demit their offices, and were earnest that the Kirk would accept of their demission. They were now turned useless members of the ecclesiastical body; their office was evacuated; they could serve no longer. The whole Assembly could not but know the matter; and as they knew for what reasons these ancient and venerable persons were so much irritated, so their own concern in the same common interest could not but prompt them to a fellow-feeling. They knew not how soon the next *Mortonian experiment* might be tried upon themselves; they, therefore, unanimously refuse to accept of the demission, and whether the Superintendents will or not, they continue them in their offices; and not only so, but they thought it expedient to renew that Article of the Agreement at Leith, viz.—"that Bishops and Superintendents stood on the same level, had the same power, the same ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and were to be regulated by the same Canons"—importing thereby that both were useful in the Church at such a juncture, and that the Church had not received Bishops to the *exauctoration* of the few surviving Superintendents, and now in their old age rendering them contemptible. And who could condemn the Assembly for taking a course that was both so natural and so obvious? Nay, it was even the *Bishops' interest*, as much as any other *Assemblymen's*, to agree to this conclusion; for the great business in hand was not about *extent* of *power*, or *point* of *dignity*—had no incentive to *jealousy* or *emulation* in it; but it was about the *revenues* of the *Church*—to secure these against the insatiable avarice of a *griping* Lord Regent—a point the Bishops were as nearly concerned in as any men. For if these three Superintendents, who had so long borne the heat of the day, and done such eminent and extraordinary services to the Church, should be once sacrificed to Morton's covetousness, how easy might it be for him to make what farther encroachments he pleased? How easy to carry on his project against other men, who, perhaps, had no such merit, no such repute, no such interest in the affections of the people? This, I say, was the reason for which

these two acts were made in this Assembly, and not that the Assembly were turning weary of Bishops, or were become any way disaffected to them. So that Calderwood and Petrie had but little reason to be so *boastful* for these two Acts.

That it was not out of any *dislike* to Episcopacy that these two Acts were made, is clear as light from the next Assembly, which met in August 1574. For therein the clergy, manifestly continuing of the same principles, and proceeding on the same reasons, order a petition, consisting of *Nine Articles*, to be drawn and presented to the Regent. Calderwood, indeed, doth not mention this petition. But it is in the MSS.; and Petrie[1] talks of it, but disingenuously, for he mentions it only *overly*, telling that "some Articles were sent unto the Lord Regent;" and he sets down but *two*, whereas, as I said, there are *nine* in the MSS., and most of them looking the Regent's sacrilegious inclinations even *staringly* in the face. I shall only transcribe such of them as cannot, when perpended, but be acknowledged to have tended that way. They are these—

"1. That stipends be granted to Superintendents in all time coming in all countries destitute thereof, whether it be where there is no Bishop, or where there are Bishops who cannot discharge their office, as the Bishops of *St Andrews* and *Glasgow*"—who had too *large* Dioceses. This Article Petrie hath but *minced*. Indeed, it is a very considerable one; for here, you see, 1. That in contradiction to the Regent's purposes the Assembly *owns* and *stands by* the *Superintendents*. They are so far from being satisfied to part with the *three* they had, that, on the contrary, they crave to have more, and to have provisions for them; and that in all countries where Bishops either *are not* or *are*, but have too *large Dioceses*. 2. They crave these things "*for all times coming*"—a clause of such importance to the main question, that Petrie has *unfaithfully* left it out. And truly I must confess, if it were lawful for men to be *unfaithful* when it might serve that which they conceived to be a *good end*, he had great reason to try it in this instance. For this clause, when (not concealed but) brought above board, gives

[1] Petrie, 384.

a fatal overthrow to all these popular pleas of Episcopacy being then obtruded on the Church, forced upon her against her will, tolerated only for a time, &c. For from this clause it is as clear, as a clause can make it, that this Assembly entertained no such imaginations. They supposed Episcopacy was to continue "for all time coming;" for, "for all time coming," they petition that provision may be made for Superintendents "where no Bishops are, or where their Dioceses are too large for them."

2. The Second Article is—"That in all burghs where the ministers are displaced, and serve at other kirks, these ministers be restored to wait on their cures, and be not obliged to serve at other churches," &c.—directly striking against the Regent's politic of *uniting three* or *four* churches under the care of *one* minister.

The 4th (which Petrie also hath) is—"That in all churches destitute of ministers such persons may be planted as the Bishops, Superintendents, and Commissioners shall name, and that stipends be assigned to them"—an Article visibly levelled at the former.

"5. That Doctors may be placed in Universities, and stipends granted them, whereby not only they who are presently placed may have occasion to be diligent in their cure, but other learned men may have occasion to seek places in Colleges"—still to the same purpose, viz. the finding reasonable uses for the patrimony of the Church.

"6. That his Grace would take a general order with the poor, especially in the Abbeys, such as are *Aberbrothock*, &c. conform to the Agreement at *Leith*." Here not only the Leith Agreement insisted on, but farther *pious use* for the Church's patrimony.

"9. That his Grace would cause the Books of the Assignation of the Kirk be delivered to the clerk of the General Assembly." These Books of Assignation, as they call them, were the books wherein the names of the ministers and their several proportions of the *Thirds* were recorded. It seems they were earnest to be repossessed of their *Thirds*, seeing the Regent had not kept promise to them.

But the eighth Article, which, by a pardonable inversion I hope, I have reserved to the last place, is of all the most considerable. It is—"That his Grace would provide

qualified persons for vacant Bishopries." Let the candid reader judge now if Episcopacy, by the Leith Articles, was *forced* upon the Church against *her inclinations?* If it was never approven (when Bishops were thus petitioned for) by a General Assembly? If it be likely that the Assembly in August 1572 protested against it as a corruption? If the Acts of the last Assembly, declaring Bishops to have no more power than Superintendents had, and making them accountable to the General Assembly, proceeded from any dislike of Episcopacy? If this Assembly, petitioning thus for Bishops, believed the *Divine* and *indispensible institution* of *parity?* If both Calderwood and Petrie acted not as became cautious Presbyterian historians—the *one* by giving us *none*, the other by giving us only a *minced* account of this Petition? Well, by this time, I think, I have not entirely disappointed my reader. I think I have made it competently appear that the Agreement at Leith was fairly and frequently allowed, approven, and insisted on, by not a few subsequent General Assemblies. I could adduce some Acts more of the next Assembly, which met at Edinburgh, March 7, 1575, but I think I have already made good my undertaking, and therefore I shall insist no further on this point. Only *one* thing I must add further. It is this—After the most impartial, narrow, and attentive search I could make, I have not found all this while—viz. from the first public establishment of the Reformed religion in Scotland, anno 1560—so much as *one indication* of either public or private *dislike* to *Prelacy;* but that it constantly and uninterruptedly prevailed, and all persons cheerfully, as well as quietly, submitted to it, till the year 1575, when it was first called in question. And here I might fairly shut up this long, and perhaps, nauseous discourse upon the Second Inquiry which I proposed; for, whatever men our Reformers were—whatever their other principles might be—I think I have made it plain, that they were not for the *Divine right of parity*,[1]

[1] [The best comment that can be offered upon the whole of this masterly argument is the opinion of the candid Presbyterian, Dr Cook, who, in treating of this period of Scottish ecclesiastical history, thus writes—"Although the Church of Scotland must be considered as having adopted at this time Episcopacy, and although that adoption proceeded upon grounds so rational, and so conformable to the principles of the Reformers,

or the "unlawfulness of the superiority of any office in the Church above Presbyters." No such principle was

the zealous Presbyterians of after times looked back with regret to this part of the ecclesiastical history of their country, and endeavoured *very unnecessarily*, and in *express opposition* to the language and proceedings of the Church, to represent the resolutions framed at Leith as having been rashly made, as having been forced upon the ministers, and as having never received the explicit sanction of the General Assemblies—an effect of party zeal not uncommon, but weakening the cause which it was designed to support." In a note the Doctor adds—"Calderwood, Petrie, Wodrow, and a *controversial writer about the period of the Revolution (no other than Gilbert Rule himself)* adopted this mode of treating with contempt the first appearance of Episcopacy in the Reformed Church of Scotland, but they have in my estimation been satisfactorily answered by the author of the Fundamental Charter of Presbytery." Cook's History, vol. i. p. 186. This conclusion, warranted by the facts of the case, and being the deliberate conviction of an avowed Presbyterian, is very important to the argument contained in the present treatise, clearly proving that those who began and carried through the Scottish Reformation, did not hold that the "superiority of any office in the Church above Presbyters was unlawful;" and that there was *at least* one period *since* the Reformation when Episcopacy was not considered "a grievance to the nation," nor "contrary to the inclinations of the generality of the people." It must not be forgotten that this form of Episcopacy which was now introduced, was partly devised by Wimram, the friend of Knox, and that zealous Reformer himself lived to see it in operation, and to confer upon it his dying approval. Almost the last act of his life was a letter sent to the Assembly at Perth in 1572, which he was unable to attend personally from extreme illness, together with ten articles on subjects which he considered to be of vital importance to the welfare of the Kirk. In these articles, which were transmitted to the Assembly by Mr Robert Pont and his friend Wimram, the bearers also of the letter, he *assented* to the change of polity, for he urged the Assembly to obtain the sanction of the Regent—"that all Bishoprics vacand may be presented, and qualified persons nominat thereunto, within a year after the vaiking thereof, *according to the Order taken at Leith*;" and again he speaks of "the Bishops *lawfully* elected" according to the same Order. Book of the Universall Kirk, p. 248. It is worthy of remark, in connection with Knox's *approval*, that in the Assembly at St Andrews in March 1571, to which the Acts of the Leith Convention were ordered to be reported, the committee appointed for "hearing and *approving of*" the report adjourned for that purpose to *the house of Knox*; from which it may fairly be inferred that he was neither opposed to the object, nor displeased with the result of their deliberations. Book of the Universall Kirk, Part I. pp. 208, 238. It has been remarked by Dr Cook that "the Episcopal polity which issued from the Convention of Leith appears to have been admirably calculated for securing a useful and efficient ministry," and to have "*established an excellent system of control*." To this unprejudiced admission, by one who himself has had sad experience of the *want of control* inherent in the practical operation of Parity, we cordially assent, and feel warranted in assigning, as the cause of the excellence of the Tulchan system, its close approximation to the

professed or insisted on, or offered to be reduced to practice by them, *before*, *at*, or full fifteen years *after* the public establishment of the Reformation. And if this *may not* pass for sufficient proof of the truth of my *resolution* of the Inquiry, I know not what may.

However, because the SECOND thing I promised to shew, though not precisely necessary to my main design, may yet be so far useful as to bring considerably more of light to it, and withal give the world a prospect of the *rise* and *progress* of *Presbytery* in *Scotland*, I shall endeavour to make good my undertaking, which was, that after Episcopacy was questioned, it was not easily overturned; its adversaries met with much resistance and opposition in their endeavours to subvert it. I shall study brevity as much as the weight of the matter will allow me. In short, then, take it thus.

Master Andrew Melville, after some years spent at Geneva, returned to Scotland in July 1574. He had lived in that city under the influences of Theodore Beza, the *true parent* of *Presbytery*. He was a man by nature fierce and fiery, confident and peremptory, peevish and ungovernable. Education in him had not sweetened nature, but nature had soured education; and both conspiring together, had tricked him up into a true original—a piece compounded of pride and petulance, of jeer and jangle, of satire and sarcasm, of venom and vehemence. He hated the *crown* as much as the *mitre*, the *sceptre* as much as the *crosier*, and could have made as bold with the *purple*[1] as with the

ancient order of the Church, which had been violently interrupted in Scotland. It was, as far as human power could make it, an Episcopacy, but it wanted the "life divine" which is communicated through the unbroken chain of the *Apostolical Succession*. It was like the chiselled marble as compared with the living man; it bore a striking resemblance, but there was wanting the principle of vitality which fills the form with warmth, and lights up every feature with vivacity. This deficiency destroys its beauty in the eyes of the Churchman, who, putting its *schismatical* character out of the question, must estimate it, after all, as a mere *scheme*, devised by the ministers for their own personal convenience, and embraced by the civil power for purposes of political expediency.—E.]

[1] Calderwood, 329.—[The allusion here is to a scene which Calderwood relates, singularly characteristic of what an eminent Non-Intrusion Doctor calls "the stern democracy" of Presbyterianism, at least that species of it of which he is such a distinguished ornament. Upon a certain occasion a deputation from the General Assembly, of whom Andrew Melville was one,

rochet.[1] His prime talent was *lampooning*[2] and writing *anti-tami-cami-categorias*. In a word, he was the very *archetypal bitter beard* of the party.

This man, thus accoutred, was scarcely warm at home when he began to disseminate his sentiments, insinuate them into others, and make a party against *Prelacy* and for the *Genevan model*. For this I need not depend on

waited on James VI. for the redress of some grievance, and being admitted into the royal closet, found the King in an irritable humour, and disposed to treat them with contempt. But the stern democrat Andrew, determined to show his Majesty that *he* was not to be trifled with, called him "God's sillie vassal," and catching him by the sleeve, said—"Sir, we will humbly reverence your Majesty always in public, but we have this occasion to be with you in private; and therefore, Sir, as divers times before, so now I must tell you that there are two Kings and two kingdoms. There is Christ and His kingdom the Kirk, whose subject King James is, and of whose kingdom he is not a King, nor a Head, nor a Lord, but a member; and they whom Christ hath called and commanded to watch over His Kirk, and govern His spiritual kingdom, have sufficient power and authoritie from Him so to do, which no Christian King nor Prince should controul nor discharge, but fortifie and assist, otherwise they are not faithful subjects to Christ. Sir, when you were in your swaddling-clothes Christ reigned freely in this land, in spite of all His enemies," &c. In this mode of address from subjects to their sovereign we behold the germs of that unlicensed freedom of speech which in after years was used to the unfortunate Charles I., and which, in more recent times, in pamphlets and platform exhibitions, has been adopted towards Queen Victoria! It *may* be justifiable, but we do not feel ourselves called upon to adduce arguments in its defence.—E.]

[2] Calderwood, 548.—[This refers to a sample of Melville's unbecoming behaviour, when summoned to London with seven others of his brethren in 1606. On one occasion, after insulting Archbishop Bancroft with abusive language, he took hold of the "white sleeve of his rochet," and shaking it, "called them Popish rags."—E.]

[3] [He was the author of six vulgar Latin verses upon the English Service, which he ignorantly compared with that of Rome. It appears that he had attended service in the Chapel-Royal on St Michael's Day, and had been severely shocked by some ornaments which were on the Altar (and which are still to be seen in Cathedrals and many parish churches of England, being enjoined by the Rubric), viz. two copies of the Liturgy, the chalices used at the celebration of the Eucharist, and two candlesticks. The verses were—

"Cur stant clausi Anglis libri duo, regiâ in arâ
Lumina cœca duo, pollubra sicca duo?
Num sensum, cultumque Dei tenet Anglia clausum,
Lumine cœca suo, sorde sepulta suâ?
Romano et ritu dum regalem instruit aram,
Purpuream pingit religiosa lupam."—E.]

Spottiswoode's authority, though he asserts it plainly.[1] I have a more *authentic* author for it, if more authentic can be. I have *Melville* himself for it, in a letter to Beza, dated November 13, 1579, to be found both in Petrie,[2] and in the pamphlet called "Vindiciæ Philadelphi," from which Petrie had it, of which letter the very first words are—"We have not ceased these five years to fight against Pseudo-Episcopacy," &c. Now, reckon *five years* backward from *November* 1579, and you stand at *November* 1574, whereby we find that within three or four months after his arrival the *plot* was begun, though it was near to a year thereafter before it came above board.

Having thus *projected* his work, and formed his party, the next care was to get one to *table* it fairly. He himself was but lately come home; he was much a stranger in the country having been ten years abroad; he had been but at very few General Assemblies, if at any; his influence was but *green* and *budding*, his authority but *young* and *tender*. It was not fit for him, amongst his first appearances, to propose so great an innovation. And, it seems, the *thinking men* of his party, however resolutely they might promise to *back* the motion, when once fairly *tabled*, were yet a little *shy* to be the *first* proposers. So it fell to the share of *one* who at that time was none of the greatest statesmen.

John Durie, one of the ministers of Edinburgh, was the person, as Spottiswoode describes him[3]—"A sound hearted man, far from all dissimulation, open, professing what he thought, earnest and zealous in his cause, whatever it was; but too credulous, and easily to be imposed on." However, that I may do him as much justice as Spottiswoode has done him before me, a man he was who thought no shame to acknowledge his error when he was convinced of it; for so it was, that when, after many years' experience, he had satisfied himself that *Parity* had truly proved the *parent* of *confusion*, and disappointed all his expectations, and when through age and sickness he was not able in person to attend the General Assembly, anno 1600, he gave commission to some brethren to tell them, as from him —"That there was a necessity of restoring the ancient

[1] Spottiswoode, 275. [2] Petrie, 401. [3] Spottiswoode, 458.

government of the Church," &c. Such was the man, I say, to whose share it fell to be the *first* who publicly questioned the *lawfulness* of *Prelacy* in Scotland, which was not done till the *sixth* day of *August* 1575—as I said before, no less than full fifteen years after the first legal establishment of our *Scottish* Reformation. And so I come to my purpose.

On this *sixth* of *August* 1575, the General Assembly met at Edinburgh. According to the Order then observed in General Assemblies, the *first* thing done after the Assembly was constituted, was the trial of the doctrine, diligence, lives, &c. of the Bishops and other constant members. So, while this was a-doing, John Durie stood up, and protested—" That the trial of the Bishops might not prejudge the opinions and reasons which he and other brethren of his mind had to propose against the office and name of a Bishop."[1] Thus was the *fatal* controversy set on *foot*, which since hath brought such miseries and calamities on the *Church* and *Kingdom* of Scotland.

The *hare* thus *started*, Melville, the original *huntsman*, strait pursued her. He presently began a long and no doubt premeditated harangue—commended Durie's zeal, enlarged upon the flourishing state of the Church of Geneva, insisted on the sentiments of Calvin and Beza concerning church government, and at last affirmed—" That none ought to be office-bearers in the Church whose titles were not found in the Book of God—that though the title of Bishops was found in Scripture, yet it was not to be understood in the sense then current—that Jesus Christ, the only Lord of his Church, allowed no superiority amongst the ministers, but had instituted them all in the same degree, and had endued them with equal power." Concluding—" That the corruptions which had crept into the estate of Bishops were so great as, unless the same were removed, it could not go well with the Church, nor could religion be long preserved in purity."[2] The controversy thus plainly stated, Mr David Lindesay, Mr George Hay, and Mr John Row, *three* Episcopalians, were appointed to confer and reason upon the question proponed with Mr Andrew Melville, Mr James Lawson, and Mr John Craig,

[1] MSS. Petrie, 385 ; Spottiswoode, 275 ; Calderwood, 68.
[2] Spottiswoode, 275 ; Petrie, 387.

two Presbyterians, and *one* much indifferent for both sides. "After divers meetings and long disceptation," saith Spottiswoode[1]—"*after two days*," saith Petrie[2]—they presented these conclusions to the Assembly, which at that time they had agreed upon.

"1. They think it not expedient presently to answer directly to the First Question. But if any Bishop shall be chosen who hath not such qualities as the Word of God requires, let him be tried by the General Assembly *de novo*, and so deposed.

"2. The name Bishop is common to all them who have particular flocks, over which they have particular charges, to preach the Word, administer the Sacraments, &c.

"3. Out of this number may be chosen some to have power to oversee and visit such reasonable bounds, beside his own flock, as the general Kirk shall appoint; and in these bounds to appoint ministers, with consent of the ministers of that province, and of the flock to whom they shall be appointed; also, to appoint elders and deacons in every principal congregation where there are none, with consent of the people thereof, and to suspend ministers for reasonable causes, with consent of the ministers aforesaid." So, the MSS., Spottiswoode, Petrie, Calderwood.[3]

It is true, here are some things which, perhaps, when thoroughly examined, will not be found so exactly agreeable to the sentiments and practice of the Primitive Church. However, it is evident for this *bout* the *Imparity men* carried the day; and it seems the *Parity men* have not yet been so well fixed for the *Divine* and *indispensible right* of it, as our *modern Parity men* would think needful, otherwise how came they to consent to such conclusions? How came they to yield that it was not expedient at that time to answer directly to the first question, which was concerning the lawfulness of Episcopacy? Were they of the modern principles —G[ilbert] R[ule]'s principles? Did they think that *Divine institutions* might be *dispensed* with, *crossed*, according to the *exigencies* of *expediency* or *inexpediency?* What an honour is it to the party if their first heroes were such casuists?

[1] Spottiswoode, 275.

[2] Petrie, 386. [3] Spottiswoode, 275; Petrie, 386; Calderwood, 69.

Besides, is not the lawfulness of *Imparity* clearly imported in the *Third Conclusion?* Indeed, both Calderwood and Petrie acknowledge so much.

Calderwood[1] saith—"It seemeth that by reason of the Regent's authority, who was bent upon the course (i. e. *Episcopacy*) whereof he was the chief instrument, that they answered not directly at this time to the Question." Here, you see, he owns that nothing at this time was concluded against the *course*, as he calls it; whether he had reason to say, *It seemed* to be upon such an account, shall be considered afterward. Petrie[2] acknowledges it too; but in such a *passion*, it seems, as quite mastered his *prudence* when he did it; for these are his words—"Howbeit in these conclusions they express not the negative, because they would not plainly oppose the particular interest of the Council, seeking security of the possessions by the title of Bishops; yet these affirmatives take away the pretended office." Now, let the world consider the *wisdom* of this author in advancing this *fine period*. They did not express the negative (they did not condemn Episcopacy), because they would not plainly oppose the particular interest of the Council seeking security of the possessions, &c. Now, let us inquire who were these—*they*—who would not for this reason condemn Episcopacy at that time? It must either belong to the *six Collocutors* who drew the conclusions, or to the *whole Assembly*. If to the *Collocutors*, it is plain *three* of them, viz. Row, Hay, and Lindesay, were innocent; they were persuaded in their minds of the *expediency* (to say no further) as well as the *lawfulness* of Episcopacy, and I think that was reason enough for them not to *condemn* it. The *Presbyterian brethren* then, if any, were the persons who were moved not to condemn it, "because they would not plainly oppose the particular interest of the Council," &c. But if so, hath not Mr Petrie made them very *brave fellows?* Hath he not fairly made them such friends to *sacrilege*, that they would rather *baulk* a *Divine institution* than interrupt its *course*, and offend its *votaries?* If by the word *they* he meant the General Assembly—if the whole Assembly were *they*, who would not express the *negative*, "because they

[1] Calderwood, 69. [2] Petrie, 387.

would not oppose?" &c. I think Mr Petrie, were he alive, would have enough to do to prove that that was the reason they were determined by. What? Had the whole Church quit all their pretensions they insisted on so much on every occasion? Had they now given over their *claim* to the revenues of the Church? Shall I declare my poor opinion in this matter? I am apt to believe that it was one of the great arguments insisted on by the three Episcopalian Collocutors at that time—"That if Episcopacy should be concluded unlawful, and by consequence overturned, the patrimony of the Church would undoubtedly go to wreck—the hungry courtiers would presently possess themselves of the revenues belonging to the Bishops." Sure I am, as things then stood, there was all the reason in the world for insisting on this argument. But to pass this. Petrie, it seems, was not content with giving the *quite contrary* of that, which in all probability was the true reason—at least one of the true reasons for not overturning Episcopacy at that time; but he behoved to add something more extravagant. He behoved to add *that the affirmatives* in the aforesaid conclusions *took away the pretended office* of Episcopacy. What might he not have said after this? It seems that in this author's opinion all is one thing to assert the lawfulness of an office, and thereupon to *continue it*, and to *take it away*. But perhaps I may be blamed for taking so much notice of an angry man's excesses, for no doubt it was anger that such conclusions should have been made, that hurried him upon such extravagances; and therefore I shall leave him, and return to my thread.

By what I have told, it may be easy to judge how cold the first entertainment was, which Parity got when it was proposed to the General Assembly; and so much the more, if it be further considered that by this same Assembly some eight or nine Articles were ordered to be presented to *my Lord Regent's Grace*, whereof the *first*—as I find it in the MSS. and in Petrie himself,[1] though neither so fully nor so fairly—was this—

"*Imprimis*, For planting and preaching the Word through the whole Realm, it is desired, that so many ministers as

[1] Petrie, 385.

may be had, who are yet unplaced, may be received as well in the country, to relieve the charge of them who have many kirks, as otherwise, throughout the whole Realm, with Superintendents or Commissioners within these bounds where Bishops are not, and to help such Bishops as have too great charges. And that livings be appointed to the aforesaid persons; and also payment to them who have travelled before as Commissioners in the years of God 1573 and 1574, and so forth in time coming, without which the travels of such men will cease."

This, I say, is the first of many Articles ordered by this Assembly for the Regent, from which it is evident not only that Mr Melville's project made little or no progress at this time, but also that the Assembly continued firm and stedfast in the same very intentions, and of the same very principles which had prevailed in former Assemblies, viz. to stop the uniting of churches, to multiply the number of persons cloathed with *Prelatic* power, to continue that *power* in the Church, and by all means to secure her patrimony, and guard against and exclude all alienations of it.

Melville and his partisans, thus successless in their first attempt, but withal once engaged, and resolved not to give over, began, it seems, against the next Assembly, to reflect on what they had done, and perceive that they had mistaken their measures. And, indeed, it was a little precipitantly done at the very first, to state the question simply and absolutely upon the *lawfulness* or *unlawfulness* of Episcopacy in the general, as they had stated it. It was a new question, which had never been stated in the Church of Scotland before, and it could not but be *surprising* to the greatest part of the Assembly. Thus to call in question *the lawfulness* of an *office* which had been so *early*, so *universally*, so *usefully*, so *incontestedly* received by the *Catholic Church*—this was a point of great importance. For to declare that office *unlawful*, what was it else than to condemn all these Churches in the Primitive times which had owned it, and flourished under it? What else than to condemn the *Scottish Reformation*, and *Reformers* who had never questioned it; but, on the contrary, had proceeded all alongst on principles which clearly supposed its *lawfulness*, if not its *necessity?* Nay, was it not to condemn particularly

all these General Assemblies which, immediately before, had so much authorized and confirmed it? Besides, as hath been already observed, to declare Episcopacy *unlawful* was unavoidably to stifle all these projects they had been so industriously forming for recovering the Church's patrimony; and not only so, but to expose it more and more to be devoured by the voracious laity. It was plain it could no sooner be declared *unlawful* than it behoved to be parted with; and *turn out the Bishops once, and what would become of the Bishopricks?* Nay, to turn them out, what was it else than to undo the whole Agreement at Leith, which was the greatest security the Church then had for her patrimony? For these and the like reasons, I say, laying aside the *impiety*, and insisting only on the *imprudence* of the *Melvillian project*, it was no doubt precipitantly done at the very first to make that the *state* of the *question*. And it was no wonder if the Assembly was unanimous in agreeing to the conclusions which had been laid before them by the *six Collocutors*. Nay, it was no wonder if Melville and his party, sensible of their error, and willing to cover it the best way they could, yielded for that time to the other *three*, who had so visibly the advantage of them, at least in the point of the Church's interest. And, therefore, at the next Assembly, which was holden at Edinburgh, April 24, 1576, they altered the state of the question, as Spottiswood observes,[1] and made it this—"Whether Bishops, as they were then in Scotland, had their function warranted by the Word of God?" But even thus stated at that time, it availed them nothing. for—as it is in the MSS.—"The whole Assembly, for the most part, after reasoning and long disputation upon every Article of the brethren's"—viz. the six Collocutors'[1]—"opinion and advice, resolutely approved and affirmed the same, and every Article thereof, as the same was given in by them." And then the Articles are repeated.

Calderwood and Petrie do both shuffle over the state of the question,[2] but upon the matter they give the same account of the Assembly's resolution. However, I thought fit to take it in the words of the MSS., the very *stile* importing that they are the *most authentic*. And in this resolution we may observe these three things:—

[1] Spottiswoode, 276. [2] Calderwood, 72; Petrie, 387.

1. That whatever the *Melvillian party* might then be, they were but the *smaller* party. *The whole Assembly for the most part*, that is, as I take it, the far greater part of the Assembly, was against them.

2. That the *whole Assembly for the most part* seem to have been seriously persuaded they were in the right, and did not *approve* and *affirm* these Articles either *indeliberately* or *faintly;* for it was after *reasoning and long disputation* that they *approved* and *affirmed* them, and they were sufficiently *keen* in the matter, for they did it *resolutely*.

3. The *Melvillian party* were *over-voted*, even as the *question* was then *stated*. The *whole Assembly for the most part* stood for Episcopacy as it was then established in Scotland, and would not declare it unlawful. From all which I leave to the world to judge if *Presbyterian parity* did not meet with opposition—with very great opposition—at its first appearances in Scotland. Neither was this all.

As this General Assembly did thus stand its ground, and appeared for *Imparity*, so it continued of the same sentiments and resolutions with former Assemblies in the matter of the Church's patrimony; for, by it, it was resolved also—"That they might proceed against unjust possessors of the patrimony of the Church, in respect of the notorious scandal, not only by doctrine and admonition, but with the censures of the Church, and that the patrimony of the Church, whereupon the Church, the poor, and the schools, should be maintained, was *ex jure divino*." So it is in the MSS., and so Petrie hath it.[1] Well! Did the *Parity-men* gain no ground in this Assembly? Yes, they did; two things they obtained, which were very useful for them afterwards. 1. They obtained an Act to be made, that "the Bishops should be obliged to take the charge of particular congregations." It is true, the Assembly could not get this refused after they had approved and affirmed the above mentioned Articles, for it was fairly deducible both from the second and third. But, then, it is plain this Act did militate nothing against the *essentials* of Episcopacy; it was highly consistent with *Imparity* amongst the governors of the Church, and the Articles evidently import as much. However, as I said,

[1] Petrie, 387.

this proved very serviceable to the *Melvillian party* afterwards, as we shall hear. But this was not the worst of it; for—

2. The Earl of Morton, then Regent, whatever the Presbyterian historians talk of his being so much for Episcopacy, made a very ill-favoured as well as a very fatal step in the time of this Assembly. Take it in Spottiswoode's words[1]—"The Regent, hearing how the Church had proceeded, and taking ill the deposition of Master James Paton, Bishop of Dunkeld, who was in the former Assembly deprived for dilapidation of his benefice, sent to require of them (this Assembly met in April 1576,) whether they would stand to the policy agreed unto at *Leith*? And if not, to desire them to settle upon some form of government at which they would abide."

The champions for *Parity* had fairly met with a second repulse from this Assembly, as I have discoursed; and if all concerned had acted their parts as they might and ought to have done, and as the cause required, it is highly credible that *Mother of Confusion* might have been quite crushed and stifled for ever. But that was not done. The Prelates themselves were negligent and unactive, as Spottiswoode intimates,[2] and here the Regent made this proposition—a proposition than which none could be made more surprizingly obliging and acceptable to the Presbyterian party. All things considered, it was the very thing the common principles of conduct might have taught them to have asked *next*, if they had had things for the *asking*. For what can fall out more luckily for those who have a mind to innovate than to have the *old* foundations *shaken*, and *leave* allowed to erect *new models?* So ill-favoured, I say, was this step, which at this time was made by Morton, who, by the exigencies of his station, was bound to have guarded against all innovations, especially such as had so natural a tendency to disturb the public peace; and, therefore, I must ask my reader's allowance to make a little digression, if it may be called a digression, and discourse this question—Whether it may not be thought probable that Morton made this proposition *deliberately*, and from an *intention* to *cherish* the *Presbyterian party*, and encourage their humour for innovating, and confounding the *peace* of the Church?

[1] Spottiswoode, 276. [2] Spottiswoode, 276.

This, perhaps, at first sight may seem a bold question, as not only being *new*, but apparently *crossing* the received accounts of our Presbyterian historians; but if I can make the affirmative very probable, if not evident, I am apt to think it may bring no small accessions of light to the present subject I am insisting on, viz. how Presbyterianism was first introduced into Scotland? I will, therefore, lay down my reasons for it, that the world may judge of them.

And, 1. That which I have already discoursed seems to be a very fair argument, that Morton made this proposition *intentionally*, to give *scope* and *slackened reins* to the Presbyterian party; for if he had not made it—if he had resolved to stand by the Agreement at Leith—if he had been serious for the established government and peace of the Church, it had been easy for him to have suppressed all Melville's projects for innovation. He had visibly the major part of this Assembly of his side, if that had been his aim. No appearance that the body of the people was then infected with the principles of Parity. The Nobility were generally for the old constitution, as is evident from no less authority than Melville's own, in his letter to Beza cited before, in which he tells him, he and his party *had many of the Peers against them*.[1] Where, then, was there the least difficulty of *crushing* the *cockatrice* in the egg, if he had had a mind for it? Besides, how inconsistent was the making of this proposition with the *integrity* and *honesty* of a Regent? The King was then a minor, the nation had but just then emerged out of a vast ocean of civil broils and troubles, which had long harassed it, and kept it in confusion; nothing more improper for it than to be involved again instantly in jars and discords; so that if he had no such *plot*, as I am endeavouring to make probable he had, he was certainly very unfortunate in granting such a *liberty*. For, considering all things, it looks so very like a *plot*, that it cannot but be very hard to persuade a thinking man that there was none, especially if it be considered,

2. That he was a man who had *latitude* enough to do ill things, if he thought them subservient to his *interest*. He was wretchedly *covetous*, as all historians agree, and that vice alone disposes a man for the worst things. He hath

[1] Petrie, 401.

observed little of the affairs of the world, and the extravagances of mankind, who has not observed avarice and a sordid temper to have put men on the most abominable courses—who hath not observed, who hath not *seen*, that men have sold religion, honour, conscience, loyalty, faith, friendship, every thing that is sacred, for money. Now by making this proposition, he projected a very fair opportunity for gratifying this his predominant appetite. He had so anxiously coveted the emoluments of the Archbishoprick of St Andrews in the year 1571, as Sir James Melville tells us in his Memoirs,[1] that meeting with a repulse, he forsook the Court, and was so much discontented that he would not return to it till Randolph, the English ambassador, persuaded Lennox, then Regent, to give it to him; promising that the Queen of England should recompense it to him with greater advantage. How much of that Bishoprick he had continued still to possess after the Agreement of Leith, and Douglas's advancement to that Archbishoprick, I cannot tell; but it is not to be doubted, whatever it was, it sharpened his stomach for more of the Church's revenues. And now the juncture made wonderfully for him; for as he had found by experience, and many Acts of Assemblies, &c., that the Church, careful of her interests, and watchful over her patrimony, was no ways inclined to sit still, and suffer herself to be cheated and plundered according to his hungry inclinations, but was making, and like to continue to make, vigorous opposition to all such sacrilegious purposes, so long as she continued united, and settled on the foot on which she then stood; so he found that now contention was arising within her own bowels, and a party was appearing zealous for innovations, and her peace and unanimity were like to be broken and divided. And what more proper for him, in these circumstances, than to lay the reins on their necks, and cast a further bone of contention amongst them? He knew full well what it was to *fish in troubled waters*, as Sir James Melville observes of him,[2] and so it is more than probable he would not neglect such an opportunity; still so much the more, if it be considered,

3. That whatever professions he might have made in

[1] Melville's Memoirs, 110. [2] Melville's Memoirs, Ibid.

former times of good affection to Episcopal government, yet there is little reason to think that his conscience was interested in the matter; for besides that covetous, selfish, subtle men, such as he was, use not to allow themselves to stand too precisely upon all the dictates of a *nice* and tender conscience, the *Divine right* of Episcopacy—the true *fund* for making it matter of conscience—in these times was not much asserted or thought on. That was not till several years afterwards, when the controversies about the government of the Church came to be sifted more narrowly. It is commonly acknowledged, that the main argument which prevailed with *him* to appear for Episcopacy, was its aptitude for being part of a *fund* for a *good correspondence* with England. Spottiswoode tells us[1] that one of the injunctions which he got when he was made Regent was—"That he should be careful to entertain the amity contracted with the Queen of England." And Calderwood saith thus expressly of him[2]—"His great intention was to bring in conformity with England in the Church government, without which he thought he could not govern the country to his phantasie, or that agreement could not stand long between the two countries." And again[3]—"He pressed his own injunctions and conformity with England." Now, this being the great motive that made him so much inclined at any time for Episcopal government—

4. It is to be considered that, however prevalent this might be with him when first he was advanced to the Regency, civil dissensions raging then, and the party of which he was the head being unable to subsist unless supported by England; yet, now that all these dissensions were ended, and the country quieted, and things brought to some appearance of a durable settlement, his dependence on England might prompt him to alter his scheme, and incline him to give scope to the Presbyterian *wild-fire* in Scotland. To set this presumption in its due light, two things are to be a little further inquired into.

1. If it is probable that Queen Elizabeth was willing that the *Presbyterian humour* should be *encouraged in Scotland.*

2. If Morton depended so much on her as to make it

[1] Spottiswoode, 267. [2] Calderwood, 66. [3] Ibid. 80.

feasible that he might be subservient to her designs, in this politic.

As for the first, this is certain, it was still one of Queen Elizabeth's great cares to encourage confusions in Scotland. She knew her own title was *questionable*,[1] as I have observed before, and though that had not been, yet without question the *Scottish blood* had the next *best* title[2] to the *English crown*. And as it is natural to most people to worship the rising sun, especially when he looks bright and glorious—when he has no clouds about him, I mean, the *apparent heir* of a throne, when he is in a prosperous and flourishing condition, so it is as natural for the *regnant Prince* to be *jealous* of him. Therefore, I say, Queen Elizabeth for her own security, did still what she could to *kindle* wild-fire in Scotland, and *keep* it *burning* when it was *kindled*. Thus, in the year 1560 she assisted the Scottish subjects against their native sovereign (her jealoused competitrix) both with men and money, as I have told before; and, anno 1565, she countenanced the Scottish Lords who began to raise tumults about the Scottish Queen's marriage with the Lord Darnley. She furnished them with money, and harboured them when they were forced to flee for it. And how long did she foment our civil wars, after they broke out, anno 1567? What dubious responses did she give all the time she *umpired* it between the *Queen* of Scotland and those who appeared for *her son?* And is it not very well known that she had an hand in the Raid of Ruthven,[3] 1582, and in all our *Scottish seditions*

[1] [She was the daughter of Henry VIII. by Anne Boleyn, whom he married after having divorced Catharine of Arragon without the consent of the Pope, and, as was thought by some, upon an insufficient pretence. —E.]

[2] [Mary Queen of Scots was daughter of James V., whose mother was sister of Henry VIII.—E.]

[3] [The popular name applied to a conspiracy of the Scottish Nobility for getting possession of the person of James VI., who, after a fatiguing day of hunting, was invited by the Earl of Gowrie to pass the night at Ruthven Castle, in the parish of Tippermuir, Perthshire; but in the morning, when the Monarch wished to depart, he found himself a prisoner in the hands of his rebellious subjects, who otherwise treated him with no great personal respect. The King did not escape from this restraint for nearly nine months. For a very minute account of this curious affair see "Historical Tales of the Wars of Scotland," Edin. 1839, vol. i. p. 126-140, a publication full of interesting and useful matter.—E.]

generally? Sir James Melville, in his Memoirs, gives us enough of her practices that way. He lived in these times, and was acquainted with intrigues; and he tells us[1]—"That Randolph came with Lennox (when he came to Scotland to be Regent after Moray's death) to stay here as English resident"—that this Randolph's great employment was to foster discords and increase divisions among the Scots, particularly—"*that he used craft with the ministers*,[2] *offering gold to such of them as he thought could be prevailed with to accept his offer*." It is true, he adds—"*But such as were honest refused his gifts*;" but this says not that none took them, and who knows but the most fiery might have been *foremost* at receiving? It hath been so since, even when it was the *price* of the *best blood* in Britain. But to go on. Sir James tells further,[3] that—"Morton and Randolph contrived the plot of keeping the Parliament at Stirling, 1571, to forfault all the Queen's Lords, thereby to crush all hopes of agreement,—that he was so much hated in Scotland for being such an incendiary, that he was forced to return to England, Mr Henry Killegrew succeeding in his stead in Scotland[4]—that this Killegrew at a private meeting told himself plainly[5] that he was come to Scotland with a commission contrary to his inclinations, which was to encourage faction," &c. Thus practiced Queen Elizabeth, and such were her arts and influences in Scotland, before she had the opportunity of *improving* the Presbyterian humour to her purposes; and can it be imagined she would not encourage it when once it got footing? Certainly she understood it better than so. The *Sect* had set up a Presbytery at Wandsworth in Surrey in the year 1572, four years before Morton made this *proposition*—seven years before a *Presbytery* was so much as heard of in Scotland. No doubt she knew the *spirit* well enough, and how apt and well suited it was for keeping a State in disorder and trouble. Nay, I have heard from knowing persons that to this very day the Treasury Books of England (if I remember right, sure I am some *English* Record or other) bear the names of such *Scottish Noblemen* and *ministers* as were that Queen's *pensioners*, and

[1] Melville's Memoirs, 135. [2] Ibid. 109. [3] Ibid. 113.
[4] Ibid. 115. [5] Ibid. 116.

what allowances they got for their services, in fostering and cherishing seditions and confusions in their native country. From this sample, I think, it is easy to collect, at least, that it is highly probable that Queen Elizabeth was very willing that the Presbyterian humour should be encouraged in Scotland.

2. Let us try if Morton[1] depended so much on *her*, as may make it credible that he was subservient to her designs in this politic. And here the work is easy; for he was her very *creature*, he stood *by* her and he stood *for* her; *Randolph* and *he* were still in *one* bottom.[2] "The whole country was abused by Randolph and Morton. Morton and Randolph contrived the Parliament 1571," mentioned before. When Lennox the Regent was killed, "Randolph was earnest to have Morton succeed him,"[3] "Randolph had no credit but with Morton."[4] Killegrew told Sir James Melville at the private meeting mentioned before[5]—"That the Queen of England and her Council built their course neither on the late Regent Lennox nor the present Mar, but entirely on the Earl of Morton, as only true to their interests." "Morton, after Mar's death, was made Regent, England helping it with all their might.[6]" And again, in that same page, Sir James tells that those who were in the Castle of Edinburgh, and stood for Queen Mary's title, were so sensible of all this, that when Morton sent the same Sir James to propose an accommodation to them, he found it very hard to bring on an agreement between them and Morton—"for the evil opinion that was then conceived of him, and the hurtful marks they supposed, by proofs and appearances, that he would shoot at; being by nature covetous, and too great with England." And to make all this plainer yet, Sir James

[1] [The opinion of our author as to Morton's dependence upon Elizabeth, and his desire to create faction, is thus confirmed by the learned Historian of Scotland, Mr Tytler, upon the authority of unpublished letters in the State Paper Office—"Elizabeth appears to have secured the services of Morton *by a pension*, and these services were wholly directed to oppose every effort made by the Regent to restore peace to the country."—"This ambitious man ruled the Council at his will. He successfully thwarted every effort to assemble the Estates, or deliberate upon a general pacification." Tytler's History, vol. vii. p. 305-307.—E.]

[2] Melville's Memoirs, 110. [3] Ibid. 115. [4] Ibid.

[5] P. 116. [6] Ibid. 118.

tells us that Morton entertained a secret grudge against his pupil, the *young King*.—"He was ever jealous that the King would be his ruin."[1] And, England "gave greater assistances to Morton than to any former Regents, for they believed he aimed at the same mark with themselves," viz. to intricate the King's affairs—"out of old jealousies between the Stuarts and the Douglasses."[2]

Now, let all these things be laid together, and then let the *judicious* consider if it is not more than probable that, as England had a main hand in the advancement of our Reformation, so it was not wanting to contribute for the encouragement of *Presbytery* also; and that Morton, playing England's game, which was so much interwoven with his own, made this *ill-favoured proposition* to this General Assembly. But however this was, whether he had such a *plot* or not, it is clear that his making this proposition, had all the effects he could have projected by being on such a *plot*. For no sooner had he made this proposition than it was greedily entertained. It answered the *Melvillian* wishes, and it was easy for them to find colourable topicks for obtaining the consent of the rest of the Assembly; for most part of them were ready to acknowledge that there were defects, and things to be mended, in the Agreement at Leith; and it had been received by the General Assembly in August 1572 for an *interim* only. The revising of that Agreement might end some controversies; and the Regent, having made this proposition, it was not to be doubted but he would ratify what they should unanimously agree to, &c. These and the like arguments, I say, might—it is clear some arguments did—prevail with the Assembly to entertain the proposition. For a commission was forthwith drawn to nineteen or twenty persons to compose a "Second Book of Discipline"[3]—a step by which at that time the Presbyterian got a wonderful advantage over the other party; for not only were Melville and Lawson, the two first-rate Presbyterians, nominated amongst these Commissioners, but they had their business much premeditated. They had spent much thinking about it; and it is not to be doubted

[1] Melville's Memoirs, 118.

[2] Ibid. 123.

[3] MSS. Calderwood, 73; Petrie, 387.

they had Mr Beza bespoken to provide them with all the assistance he and his colleagues at Geneva could afford them. Whereas the rest were generally very ignorant in controversies of that nature. They had all alongst before that employed themselves mainly in the *Popish* controversies, and had not troubled their heads much about the *niceties* of *government*. They had taken the *ancient* government, so far at least as it subsisted by Imparity, upon trust, as they found it had been practised in all ages of the Church; perceiving a great deal of order and beauty in it, and nothing that naturally tended to have a bad influence on either the principles or the life of serious Christianity; and with that they were satisfied. Indeed, even the best of them seem to have had very little skill in the true fountains whence the solid subsistence of the *Episcopal order* was to be derived—the Scriptures, I mean, not as *glossed* by the *private spirit* of every *modern novelist*, but as interpreted and understood by the first ages—as *sensed* by the constant and universal practice of genuine, Primitive, and Catholic antiquity.

This charge of ignorance in the controversies about the government of the Church, which I have brought against the Scottish clergy in these times, will certainly leave a blot upon myself if I cannot prove it; but if I can prove it, it is clear it is of considerable importance in the present disquisition, and helps much for coming, by a just comprehension, to understand how *Presbytery* was introduced into Scotland. And, therefore, I must again beg my reader's patience till I adduce some evidences for it.

And, *first*, the truth of this charge may be obviously collected from the whole train of their proceedings and management about the government of the Church, from the very first establishment of the Reformation. For, however they established a government which clearly subsisted by *Imparity*, as I have fully proven, and which was all I still aimed at, yet it is easy to discover they were very far from keeping *closely* by the principles and measures of the Primitive constitution of Church government. This is so very apparent to any who reads the histories of these times, and is so visible in the deduction I have made, that I shall insist no longer on it.

Secondly, The truth of my charge may further appear

from the instance of Adamson, advanced this year 1576 to the Archbishoprick of St Andrews. That nature had furnished him with a good stock, and he was a smart man, and cultivated beyond the ordinary *size* by many parts of good literature, is not denied by the Presbyterian historians themselves. They never attempt to represent him as a *fool* or a *dunce*, though they are very eager to have him a man of *tricks* and *latitude*. Now, this *Prelate's* ignorance in true antiquity is remarkably visible in his subscribing to these Propositions, anno 1580, if we may believe Calderwood[1]— "The power and authority of all pastors is equal, and alike great amongst themselves. The name Bishop is relative to the flock, and not to the eldership; for he is Bishop of his flock, and not of other pastors or fellow elders. As for the pre-eminence that one beareth over the rest, it is the invention of man, and not the institution of Holy Writ. That the ordaining and appointing of pastors, which is also called the laying on of hands, appertaineth not to one Bishop only, so being lawful election pass before; but to those of the same province or Presbytery, and with the like jurisdiction and authority minister at their kirks. That in the Council of Nice, for eschewing of private ordaining of ministers, it was statuted, that no pastor should be appointed without the consent of him who dwelt or remained in the chief and principal city of the province, which they called the metropolitan city. That after, in the latter Councils, it was statuted (that things might proceed more solemnly and with greater authority), that the laying on of hands upon pastors, after lawful election, should be by the Metropolitan or Bishop of the chief and principal town, the rest of the Bishops of the province voting thereto; in which thing there was no other prerogative but only that of the town, which, for that cause, was thought most meet both for the convening of the Council, and ordaining of pastors with common consent and authority. That the estate of the Church was corrupt when the name Bishop, which before was common to the rest of the pastors of the province, began, without the authority of God's Word and ancient custom of the Kirk, to be attributed

[1] Calderwood, 93, 94.

to one. That the power of appointing and ordaining ministers and ruling of kirks, with the whole procuration of ecclesiastical discipline, was now only devolved to one Metropolitan; the other pastors no ways challenging their right and privilege therein of very slothfulness, on the one part, and the devil, on the other, going about craftily to lay the ground of the Papistical supremacy."

From these and such other Propositions, signed by him at that time, it may be judged, I say, if this *Prelate* did not betray a very profound ignorance in true ecclesiastical antiquity. An *arrant Presbyterian* could not have *said*—could not have *wished* more. Indeed, it is more than probable (as perchance may appear by and bye) that these Propositions were taken out (either formally or by collection) of Mr Beza's book—"De Triplici Episcopatu." Now, if Adamson was so little seen in such matters, what may we judge of the rest?

But this is not all. For, thirdly, there cannot be a greater evidence of the deplorable unskilfulness of the clergy, in these times, in the ancient records of the Church, than their suffering Melville and his party to obtrude upon them the "Second Book of Discipline"—a split new democratical system—a very *farce* of novelties never heard of before in the Christian Church. For instance, what else is "the confounding of the offices of Bishops and Presbyters?"[1]—the "making Doctors or Professors of Divinity in Colleges and Universities a distinct office," and "of divine institution?"[2]—the "setting up of lay-elders, as governors of the Church, *jure divino?*"—making them "judges of men's qualifications to be admitted to the Sacrament, visitors of the sick?" &c.[3]—making the "colleges of Presbyters in cities in the Primitive times lay-eldership?"[4]—prohibiting "appeals from Scottish General Assemblies to any judge civil or ecclesiastic?"[5]—and, by consequence, to Œcumenick Councils? Are not these ancient and Catholic assertions? What footsteps of these things in true antiquity? How easy had it been for men skilled in the constitution, government, and discipline of the Primitive Church, to have

[1] Cap. 2, sec. 9. [2] Ibid., and cap. 5, per tot. [3] Cap. 8, per tot.
[4] Cap. 7, sec. 16. [5] Cap. 12, sec. 8.

laid open to the conviction of all sober men the novelty, the vanity, the inexpediency, the impoliticalness, the uncatholicalness, of most, if not all, of these propositions? If any further doubt could remain concerning the little skill the clergy of Scotland in these times had in these matters, it might be further demonstrated,

Fourthly, From this plain matter of fact, viz. that that Second Book of Discipline, in many points, is taken word for word from Mr Beza's answers to the Questions proposed to him by the Lord Glammis, then Chancellor of Scotland—a fair evidence that our clergy at that time have not been very well seen in ecclesiastical politics; otherwise it is not to be thought they would have been so imposed on by a single stranger divine, who visibly aimed at the propagation of the *scheme*, which by *chance* had got footing in the Church where he lived. His tractate "De Triplici Episcopatu,"[1] written of purpose for the advancement of Presbyterianism in Scotland, carries visibly in its whole train that its design was to draw our clergy from off the *ancient* polity of the Church; and his Answers to the six Questions proposed to him, as I said, by Glammis,[2] contained the new scheme he advised

[1] [This tract declared that *three* sorts of Episcopacy had existed in the world. The first, *that* to be seen in the Word of God, was *Divine*, and of course unobjectionable, and worthy of being perpetuated. The second, to which Clement, Polycarp, Irenæus, and afterwards St Cyprian, Athanasius, &c. submitted, was a *human* invention, and therefore not necessarily either of perpetual or universal obligation. The third, as it existed under the Papal power, was a device of the enemy of souls, "*devilish*," and to be avoided by all who valued their eternal interests. Such was this celebrated treatise, which attracted the attention of the learned Saravia, who, having carefully examined it, has written a refutation of its objectionable parts. See "Diversi Tractatus Theologici," editi ab Had. Saravia, folio, London, 1611.—E.]

[2] [John eighth Lord Glammis, whose grandmother was condemned to be burnt for witchcraft, and suffered on the Castle Hill of Edinburgh in July 1537, was promoted to the office of High Chancellor of Scotland in 1575, and killed at Stirling, March 17, 1578, in an accidental affray between his followers and those of the Earl of Crawford. As Chancellor of Scotland, and feeling the difficulties which beset the Government at every step in the Scottish Reformation, on account of the irregularity with which it was conducted, Lord Glammis wrote to the famous Theodore Beza, the great Genevan Reformer, in order to obtain his opinion upon several very knotty points of law and equivocal morality. These Questions, as they relate intimately to the stirring events of those times, and display the doubts which passed through the minds of persons of station,

them to. Now, let us taste a little of his skill in the constitution and government of the ancient Church, or, if you

and all conscientious people, concerning the great and important changes which were being effected both in Church and State, we think will not be without interest to many persons, and therefore we subjoin them. They are quoted from Saravia's Works; for, strange to say, the very reason which probably obliged Bishop Sage to quote them second-hand, obliges us. There is not a complete edition of Beza's Works in any of the public Libraries in Edinburgh, and we have not been able to obtain any detached volume containing these Questions.

"*Quæstio Prima.*—Quum in singulis Ecclesiis singuli Pastores ac ministri constituti fuerint, quumque par et æqualis omnium in Ecclesia Christi ministrorum potestas videatur; queritur, sit-ne Episcoporum munus in Ecclesia necessarium, qui ministros, quum res postulabit, ad comitia vocari ad ministerium admitti, et istis de causis ab officio removeri, curabunt? an potius omnes ministri æquali potestate fungentes, nulliusque superioris Episcopi imperio obnoxii, viros idoneos in doctrina, cum consensu patroni jus patronatus habentis, et ipsius populi, eligere, corrigere, et ab officio removere debeant? Ut autem retineantur ejusmodi Episcopi, movere nos duo possunt. *Unum* populi ipsius mores et contumacia, qui vix et ne vix quidem in officio contineri potest, nisi ejusmodi Episcoporum qui universas Ecclesias percurrant et invisant, auctoritate coerceatur; *alterum*, leges regni longo usu, et inveterata consuetudine receptæ, ut quoties de rebus ad reipublicæ salutem pertinentibus in publicis regni comitiis agitur, nihil sine Episcopis constitui potest, quum ipsi tertium ordinem, et regni statum efficiant; quem aut mutare aut prorsus tollere, reipublicæ admodum esset periculosum." This question is quoted below by our author. See Index, "Glammis" or "Beza."

"*Secunda.*—Post reformatam religionem, consuetudine receptum est, ut Episcopi et ex ministris, pastoribus et senioribus, tot quot iidem Episcopi jusserint, unum in locum conveniant, cum præcipuis Baronibus, et Nobilibus religionem veram profitentibus; et de doctrina et moribus inquisituri. Nunc verò cum Princeps veræ religionis studiosus sit; quæritur, an ejusmodi conventus cogi possit sine jussu vel consensu Principis? an denique Nobilibus, aliisque pietatis studiosis, et senioribus, qui apud nos quotannis ex populo, atque adeo ex ipsa Nobilitate, eliguntur, sine mandato Regis ad ejusmodi comitia venire liceat, vel expediat. Quandoquidem Nobilium et laicorum conventus, aliis videtur sub principe pio non necessarius, quum sola consuetudine, nulla verò certa lege sub Principe religionem impugnante, paucos ante annos receptus fuerit, quo plus authoritatis ejusmodi comitia haberent. Quum præterea periculum videatur, ne si Nobiles tam frequentes, et frequenter sine consensu Regis conveniant, aliis de rebus, quam ad religionem pertinentibus aliquando deliberent. Alii vero nullo modo rejiciendos arbitrantur, quin potius valde necessarius videtur hic conventus, ut nimirum Nobiles religionem omni studio et conatu promoventes, in comitiis tanquam παραστατας et adjutores ministris adsint, ac de ipsorum vita, moribus populi, et id genus aliis, testimonium perhibeant. Alioquin futurum, si Princeps parum pius postea regnaverit, ut neque ministri tuto convenire, neque decreta sua executioni mandare, sine nobilium consensu et auxilio possint?

please, of his accounts of her policy. I take this Book as I find it amongst Saravia's Works.[1]

He is positive for the "Divine right of ruling elders."[2] He affirms that "Bishops arrogated to themselves the power of ordination, without God's allowance,"[3]—"that the chief foundation of all ecclesiastical functions is popular election"—"that this election, and not ordination, or

"*Tertia.*—A quo hoc est, an a Rege an ab Episcopis comitia Ecclesiastica cogi, quum coguntur, quibus de rebus leges ferre possunt?

"*Quarta.*—Debeant ne excommunicari papistæ eodem modo, quo apostatæ, an vero leviori pœna puniendi sunt?

"*Quinta.*—Quibus de causis aliquem excommunicare liceat? verbi gratia: si quis homicidium patraret, asserens se id vel necessitate, vel vim vi repellendo fecisse (ea de re paratus est judicium subire, neque adhuc a Rege, aut occisi proximo quovis accusatur) licet ne Ecclesiæ de homicidio inquirere, sit ne dolo malo, an casu, vel necessitate factum; et homicidam cogere ut secundum delicti qualitatem, publicam in Ecclesia pœnitentiam in sacco et cinere agat, aut recusantem excommunicatione feriat, eique aqua et igni interdicat?

"*Sexta.*—Quum superiori seculo magnæ facultates, eleemosynæ nomine a Principibus aliis que multis concessæ sint Episcopis, monasteriis et hujusmodi; quumque tantæ opes videantur potius obesse quam prodesse Episcopis, et monasteria in Reipublica et Ecclesia sint inutilia; Quæritur, quid de ejusmodi bonis, quæ semel Ecclesiæ consecrata fuerunt, fieri debeat? Nam quum Episcopi et ministri ex decimis satis habeant, unde commode et honeste vivere possint, an Princeps potest cum consensu statuum Regni reliquam partem auferre; ut vel in suos vel in publicos usus convertere illi liberum sit; præsertim cum ejusmodi bona non tam in decimis, quam in prædiis rusticis aut urbanis consistant? Quæ quidem quæstio quum potius civilis, quam Ecclesiastica esse videatur, constitueram tibi hac in re non esse molestus. Sed quia complures pii, ac eruditi apud nos existimant, has res quæ semel piis usibus destinate fuerunt, non posse in prophanos usus, etiam publicos conferri; non potui hoc quoque argumentum silentio apud te præterire?" Diversi Tractatus Theologici, p. 67-102. —E.]

[1] [This eminent person was of Spanish descent, and born at Artois in 1531. After having been Professor of Divinity at Leyden, he came over to England in 1587, where he was patronised by Archbishop Whitgift for his eminent piety and great learning. Having been admitted into holy orders, he obtained large preferment in the Church of England, having successively been promoted to a Prebend in the Cathedrals of Gloucester and Canterbury, and in the Abbey Church of Westminster. The best proof of his learning is that we find his name in the first class of the Translators of the Bible under James VI.; and the surest pledge of his piety and orthodoxy is that he was the intimate friend of the excellent and "judicious" Hooker. "These two persons," says a venerable biographer, "began a holy friendship, increasing daily to so high and mutual affections, that their two wills seemed to be but one and the same."—E.]

[2] P. 8. [3] P. 29.

imposition of hands, makes pastors or Bishops—that imposition of hands does no more than put them in possession of their ministry"—(in the exercise of it, as I take it),—"the power whereof they have from that election"—"that by consequence, it is more proper to say that the Fathers of the Church are created by the Holy Ghost, and the suffrages of their children, than by the Bishops"[1]—that St Paul, "in his first Epistle to the Corinthians, in which he expressly writes against and condemns the schism which then prevailed there, as foreseeing that Episcopacy might readily be deemed a remedy against so great an evil, joined Sosthenes with himself in the inscription of the Epistle, that by his own example he might teach how much that princeliness was to be avoided in ecclesiastical conventions, seeing the Apostles themselves, who are owned to have been, next to Christ, first in order, and supreme in degree, did yet exercise their power by the rules of parity."[2] Who will not, at first sight, think this a pretty odd fetch? But to go on. He further affirms[3] that "Episcopacy, so far from being a proper remedy against schism, has produced many grievous schisms, which had never been but for that human invention—that the Papacy was the fruit of Episcopacy[4]—that the Council of Nice by making the Canon about the Ἀρχαῖα ἔθη, that the ancient customs should continue, &c. cleared the way for the *Roman* Papacy, which was then advancing apace and founded a throne for that whore that sits upon the seven mountains"[5]—that the Primitive Churches were in a flourishing condition so long as their governors continued to act in parity, and had not yielded to Prelacy."[6] And yet he had granted before[7] that *human Episcopacy*, as he calls it, was in *vogue* in Ignatius' time, &c. So that I think they could not flourish *much*, having so short a time to *flourish in*.

These few, of many such learned Propositions, I have collected out of that Book which was so successful at that time in furthering and advancing the Presbyterian principles in Scotland; and could they be a learned clergy? Could they be great masters at antiquity and ecclesiastical history who

[1] P. 30. [2] P. 41. [3] P. 43.
[4] P. 46. [5] P. 58. [6] P. 71. [7] P. 45.

swallowed down these Propositions, or were imposed on by the Book that contained them? It is true, this Book came not to Scotland till the end of the year 1577, or the beginning of 1578. But I thought it pardonable to anticipate so far, as now to give this account of it, considering how proper it was for my present purpose. We shall have occasion to take further notice of it afterward.

Thus, I think I have made it appear how advantageous Morton's proposition was to the Presbyterian party. They had occasion by it to fall upon forming a *new scheme* of church government and polity. They were as well prepared as they could be for such a nick, and they had a set of people to deal with, who might easily be worsted in these controversies. However, it seems the common principles of politics which God and nature have made, if not inseparable parts, at least, ordinary concomitants of sound and solid reason, did sometimes make their appearances amongst them. For that there have been disputations and contests, and that some, at least of the many Propositions contained in the "Second Book of Discipline," have been debated and tossed, is evident from the many conferences that were about it, and the long time that was spent before it was perfected and got its finishing stroke from a General Assembly, as we shall find in our progress. Proceed we now in our deduction.

Though the Presbyterian faction had gained this advantage in the Assembly, 1576, that they had allowance to draw a new scheme of polity, to which they could not but apply themselves very cheerfully, yet, it seems, they were so much humbled by the repulses they had got as to the main question, viz. the *lawfulness of Episcopacy*, that they thought it not expedient to try the next Assembly with it directly, as they had done, unsuccessfully, twice before; but to wait a little, till their party should be stronger, and, in the meantime, to content themselves with such indirect blows as they could conveniently give it. Such, I say, their deliberations seem to have been at the next Assembly, which was holden at Edinburgh, October 24, 1576. For not so much as one word in that Assembly concerning the *lawfulness* or *unlawfulness* of *Prelacy*, either *simply* and in itself, or *complexly*, as *then in use in Scotland*. It is true—"certain brethren," says the MS.—"some brethren," says Calderwood—"some,"

says Petrie[1] (without question, the Melvillians)—proposed that, now that Mr Patrick Adamson was nominated for the Archbishoprick of St Andrews, he might be tried as to his sufficiency for such a station, according to an Act made in March 1575; but it seems the *major part* of the Assembly have not been for it, for it was not done, as we shall find afterward. Nay, another Act was fairly dispensed with by this Assembly in favour of Boyd, Archbishop of Glasgow; for, being required to give his answer, If he would take the *charge* of a *particular flock*, according to the Act made in April before? He answered "That he had entered to his Bishoprick according to the *Agreement* at *Leith*, which was to stand in force during the King's minority, or till a Parliament should determine otherwise—that he had given his oath to the King's Majesty in things appertaining to his Highness—that he was afraid he might incur the guilt of perjury, and be called in question by the King, for changing a member of State, if he should change any thing belonging to the order, manner, privileges, or power of his Bishoprick—that, therefore, he could not bind himself to a particular flock, nor prejudge the power of jurisdiction which he had received with his Bishoprick," &c. Thus he answered, I say, and the Assembly at that time satisfied themselves so far with this answer that they pressed him no farther, but referred the matter to the next Assembly, as even both Calderwood and Petrie acknowledge[2]—a fair evidence that in this Assembly the *Presbyterian* party was the *weaker*. However, one indirect step they gained in this Assembly also. By the "First Book of Discipline," Head 9,[3] "it was appointed that the country ministers and readers should meet upon a certain day of the week in such towns, within six miles distance, as had schools, and to which there was repair of learned men, to exercise themselves in the interpretation of Scripture, in imitation of the practice in use among the Corinthians, mentioned 1 Cor. xiv. 29." These meetings, it seems, had been much neglected, and disfrequented in most places. It was, therefore, enacted by this Assembly—"That all ministers within eight miles, &c. should resort to the place of

[1] Calderwood, 74. Petrie, 388.
[2] Calderwood, 74. Petrie, 389. [3] Spottiswoode, 170.

exercise each day of exercise," &c.[1] This, I say, was useful for the Presbyterian designs, for these meetings were afterwards turned into *Presbyteries*, as we shall find when we come to the year 1579. And so it is very like the motion for reviving them was made by those of the *faction*: for no man can deny that they have still had enough of *draught* in their *politics*.

The next Assembly was holden April 1, anno 1577. No direct progress made now, neither, as to the main question, and only these indirect ones:—"1. The Archbishop of Glasgow was obliged to take the charge of a particular flock," if we may believe Calderwood;[2] but neither the MSS.[3] nor Petrie have it. 2. "The Archbishop of St Andrews being absent, full power was given to Mr Robert Pont, Mr James Lawson, David Ferguson, and the Superintendent of Lothian, conjunctly, to cite him before them, against such day or days as they should think good; to try and examine his entry and proceeding, &c., with power also to summon the *Chapter* of *St Andrews*, or so many of that *Chapter* as they should judge expedient, and the *ordainers* or *inaugurers* of the said Archbishop—(observe here, the Bishops in these times were *ordained* or *inaugurated*)—as they should find good, for the better trial of the premises: and in the meantime to discharge him of further visitation till he should be admitted by the Church."[4] Here, indeed, the Melvillians obtained in both instances that which was refused them by the last Assembly. However, nothing done *directly*, as I said, against the Episcopal office; on the contrary, Adamson, it seems, might *exerce* it when *admitted* by the Assembly.

May I not reckon the *Fast* appointed by this Assembly as a *third* step gained by our *Parity-men?* A "successful establishment of perfect order and polity in the Kirk" was one of the reasons for it.[5] And ever since it hath been one of the *politics* of the *sect* to be *mighty* for *fasts*, when they had extraordinary projects in their heads; and then, if these

[1] MS. Calderwood, 76. Petrie, 388. [2] Calderwood, 76.

[3] [In this there is a difference between the MS. which Sage had before him, and the compilation entitled "The Booke of the Universall Kirk," published for the Bannatyne Club. The latter contains this clause, which has been probably taken from Calderwood.—E.]

[4] MS. Calderwood, 76; Petrie, 390. [5] MS. Calderwood, 79; Petrie, 391.

projects, however *wicked*, nay, though the very *wickedness* which the Scripture makes as bad as *witchcraft*, succeeded, to entitle them to God's grace, and make the success the *comfortable return* of their pious humiliations and sincere devotions.

I find also that Commissioners were sent by this Assembly to the Earl of Morton, to acquaint him that they were busy about the matter and argument of the polity, and that his Grace should receive advertisement of their further proceedings; and that these Commissioners, having returned from him to the Assembly, reported—"That his Grace liked well of their travels and labours in that matter, and required expedition and haste, promising, that when the particulars should be given in to him they should receive a good answer.[1] So Calderwood and the MSS. From which two things may be observed:—the first is, a further confirmation of the suspicion I insisted on before, viz. that Morton was truly a friend to the innovators. The second, that the "Second Book of Discipline" had hitherto gone on but very slowly. Why else would his Grace have so earnestly required *expedition* and *hasty outred* (as the MS. words it, i. e. *despatch*) and promised them a good answer when the particulars should be given in to him? The truth is, there was one good reason for their proceeding so leisurely in the matter of the Book. Beza's answer to Glammis' letter was not yet returned.

Thus two General Assemblies passed without so much as offering at a plain, a direct, *trust* [thrust?] against *Imparity;* nay, it seems matters were not come to a sufficient maturity for that even against the next Assembly. It was holden at Edinburgh, October 25, 1577; and not so much as one word in the MSS., Calderwood, or Petrie, relating either directly or indirectly to the main question. But two things happened a little after this Assembly which animated Melville and his party to purpose.

One was, Morton's quitting the Regency; for, whatever services he had done them, he was so *obscure* and *fetching* in his measures, and so little to be trusted, that they could not rely much upon him, and now that he had demitted, they

[1] Calderwood, 77.

had a fair prospect of playing their game to better purpose than ever. They were in possessions of the *allowance* he had granted them to draw a *new scheme* of policy—they had a *young King*, who had not yet arrived at the twelfth year of his age, to deal with—by consequence they were like to have a *divided* Court and a *factious* Nobility; and they needed not doubt, if there were *two factions* in the kingdom, that *one* of them would be sure to *court* them, and undertake to promote their *interests*.

The other encouragement, which did them every whit as good service, was Beza's Book—"De Triplici Episcopatu, Divino, Humano, et Satanico," with his answers to the Lord Glammis' Questions, which about this time was brought to Scotland, as is clear from Calderwood.[1] Beza, it seems, put to it to defend the constitution of the Church of Geneva, had employed his wit and parts (which certainly were not contemptible) in *patching* together such a *scheme* of principles as he thought might be defended. That is a method most men take too frequently, first, to resolve upon a *conclusion*, and then to stretch their inventions, and spend their pains for finding *colours* and *plausibilities* to set it off with. Beza, therefore, I say, having been thus at pains to digest his thoughts the best way he could on this subject, and withal being possibly not a little elevated that the *Lord High Chancellor* of a *foreign kingdom* should consult him, and ask his advice concerning a point of so great importance as the constitution of the government of a national Church, thought it not enough, it seems, to return an answer to his Lordship's Questions, and therein give him a *scheme*, which was very easy for him to do, considering he needed be at little more pains than to transcribe the Genevan establishment; but he applied himself to the main controversy which had been started by his disciple Melville in Scotland—and it is scarcely to be doubted that it was done at his instigation—and wrote this his Book, wherein, though he asserted not the *absolute unlawfulness* of that which he called *human Episcopacy*—he had not brow enough for that, as we have seen already[2]—yet he made it wonderously dangerous, as being so naturally apt

[1] Calderwood, 79.

[2] In the page of these papers.

to degenerate into the devilish—the *Satanical* Episcopacy. This Book, I say, came to Scotland about this time, viz. either in the end of 1577, or the beginning of 1578, and —though I have already given a *specimen* of it—who now could hold up his head to plead for *Prelacy?* Here was a Book written by the famous Mr Beza, the successor of the great Mr Calvin, the present great luminary of the Church of Geneva, our *elder* sister Church, the *best* reformed Church in Christendom! Who would not be convinced now that Parity ought to be established, and *Popish Prelacy* abolished? And, indeed, it seems this Book came seasonably to help the *good new cause*—for it behoved to take some time before it could merit the name of the *good old one*—for we have already seen how slowly and weakly it advanced before the Book came. But now we shall find it gathering strength apace, and advancing with a witness! Nay, at the very next Assembly it was in a pretty flourishing condition.

This next Assembly met, April 24 anno 1578, and Mr Andrew Melville was chosen Moderator. The *Prince* of the *Sect* had the happiness to be the *Preses* of the *Assembly*, and presently the work was set a-going. Amongst the first things done in this Assembly it was enacted—"That Bishops, and all others bearing ecclesiastical function, should be called by their own names, or brethren, in all time coming."[1] No more Lord Bishops! and it was but consequential to the great argument which was then, and ever since, hath been in the mouths of all the party—"the Lords of the Gentiles," &c. Matt. xx. 25. Luke xxii. 25. This was a step worthy of Mr Andrew's *humility*, which was not like other men's *humility*, consisting in *humbling themselves*, but of a new species of its own, consisting in *humbling* of his *superiors*. Indeed, after this he still treated his own Ordinary, the Archbishop of Glasgow, in *public* according to this canon; though when he was at his Grace's table, where he got better entertainment than his own *commons* (for he was then in the College of Glasgow), he could give him all his *titles* of dignity and honour.[2] But another more important Act was made by this Assembly. Take it, word for

[1] MS. Calderwood, St. Petrie, 394. [2] Spottiswoode, 303.

word, from Calderwood, who agrees exactly with both the MSS. and Petrie :[1]—"Forasmuch as there is great corruption in the state of Bishops, as they are presently set up in this realm, whereunto the Assembly would provide some stay in time coming, so far as they may, to the effect that farther corruption may be bridled; the Assembly hath concluded, that no Bishop shall be elected or admitted before the next General Assembly; discharging all ministers and chapters to proceed anyways to the election of the said Bishops in the meantime, under the pain of perpetual deprivation; and that this matter be proponed first in the next Assembly, to be consulted what farther order shall be taken therein."

Here was ground gained, indeed; however, this was but preparatory still—nothing yet concluded concerning the *unlawfulness* of the office. It was consistent with this Act, that Episcopacy should have continued, its corruptions being removed. Neither are we as yet told what these corruptions were. It seems even the Presbyterians themselves, though in a fair condition now to be the prevailing party, had not yet agreed about them. Indeed, another Assembly must be over before we can come by them. Leaving them, therefore, till we come at them, proceed we with this present Assembly.

Another fast was appointed by it. The nation, it seems, was not yet sufficiently disposed for Presbytery, rubs and difficulties were still cast in the way, and the good cause was deplorably retarded. So it is fairly imported in the Act for this fast—"The corruption of all estates, coldness in a great part of the professors—that God would put it in the King's heart, and the hearts of the Estates of Parliament, to establish such a policy and discipline in the Kirk as is craved in the Word of God," &c. These are amongst the prime reasons in the narrative of this Act for fasting.[2] Indeed, all this time the Book of Discipline was only in forming; it had not yet got the Assembly's approbation.

The next General Assembly met at Stirling, June 11, this same year, about six weeks or so after the dissolution of the former; but the Parliament was to sit, and it was

[1] Calderwood, 81; Petrie, 394. [2] MS. Petrie, 394; Calderwood, 81.

needful the Assembly should sit before, to order ecclesiastic business for it. And now, it seems, there was little struggling; for the Assembly, *all in one voice* (as it is in MSS., Calderwood, and Petrie),[1] concluded—"That the Act of the last Assembly, discharging the election of Bishops, &c., should be extended to all time coming." And here Petrie stops; but the MSS. and Calderwood add—"Ay, and while the corruptions of the estate of Bishops be all utterly taken away." And they ordained—"That all Bishops already elected should submit themselves to the General Assembly concerning the reformation of the corruptions of that estate of Bishops in their persons, which, if they refused to do, after admonition, that they should be proceeded against to excommunication." This Assembly met, as I said, on the 11*th* of *June*, and, indeed, it seems the *weather* has been *warm* enough; yet neither now did they adventure again upon the *main question*, nor enumerate the *corruptions* of the *estate* of *Bishops*. By this Assembly a commission was also granted to certain persons to attend the Parliament, and petition that the "Book of Discipline" might be ratified, though all the Articles were not as yet agreed to. A pretty *odd* overture—to desire the Parliament to *ratify* what they themselves had not perfectly *concerted!*

The next Assembly met at Edinburgh, October 24th of that same year, 1578, and it was but reasonable to have *three* Assemblies in *six* months, when the Church was so *big* with *Presbytery!* And now the corruptions so frequently talked of before were enumerated, and the Bishops were required to reform them in their persons. They were required—"1. To be ministers or pastors of one flock. 2. To usurp no criminal jurisdiction. 3. Not to vote in Parliament in name of the Kirk, without commission from the General Assembly. 4. Not to take up, for maintaining their ambition and riotousness, the emoluments of the Kirk, which ought to sustain many pastors, the schools, and the poor; but to be content with reasonable livings, according to their office. 5. Not to claim the titles of temporal Lords, nor usurp civil jurisdiction, whereby they might be abstracted from their office. 6. Not to empire it over

[1] MS. Calderwood, 82; Petrie, 395.

particular elderships, but be subject to the same." So the MSS.[1] Calderwood, and Petrie have it, though Spottiswoode has the word *Presbyteries*,[2] which I take notice of, because the unwary reader, when he reads *Presbyteries* in Spottiswoode, may take them for these ecclesiastical judicatories which now are so denominated, whereas there were none *such* as yet in the nation. "7. Not to usurp the power of the pastors"—(says the MSS.)—" nor take upon them to visit any bounds not committed to them by the Church. 8. And lastly, If any more corruptions should afterward be found in the estate of Bishops, to consent to have them reformed." These were the *corruptions*, and, particularly, at that same very time the *two Archbishops* were required to *reform them in their persons.*

What Adamson, Archbishop of St Andrews, did or said on this occasion, I know not, but it seems he submitted not: for I find him again required to do it by the next Assembly, and that it was particularly laid to his charge that he had opposed the "ratification" of the "Book" in Parliament. But Boyd, Archbishop of Glasgow, did certainly behave at this Assembly like a person of great worth, and a man of courage suitable to his character, giving a brave and resolute answer.[3] You may see it in Spottiswoode, Calder-

[1] MS. Calderwood, 85; Petrie, 397; Spottiswoode, 303.

[2] [The word "Presbyteries" *is* found in the "Book of the Universall Kirk," and was probably inserted by the compiler by mistake, as according more with modern phraseology and existing institutions. It is important, however, to mark the difference, that the tribunal of a "Presbytery" may not be ante-dated.—E.]

[3] ["I understand the name, office, and modest reverence borne to a Bishop to be lawful, and allowable by the Scriptures of God; and being elected by the Kirk and King to be Bishop of Glasgow, I esteem my calling and office lawful. As it respects my execution of that charge committed to me, I am content to endeavour, at my utmost ability, to perform the same and every point thereof, and to abide the honourable judgment of the Kirk from time to come of my offending by my duty, craving always a brotherly desire at their hands, seeing that the responsibility is weighty, and in the laying (anything) to my charge to be examined by the canon left by the Apostle to Timothy (1 Timothy iii.), because that portion (of Scripture) was appointed to me at my receipt (induction), to understand therefrom the duties of a Bishop. As towards my living, rents, and other things granted by the Prince to me and my successors, for the securing of that charge, I reckon the same lawful. As to my duty to the supreme magistrate in assisting his Grace in Council or

wood, and Petrie.[1] I have not leasure to transcribe it. But it pleased not the "*now*" too much Presbyterian Assembly; and no wonder, for he spake truely like a Bishop.

The next Assembly was holden at Edinburgh in July, anno 1579. "The King sent a letter to them, whereby he signified his dislike of their former proceedings, and fairly advised them to show more temper, and proceed more deliberately." Calderwood calls it an *harsh letter;* it is to be seen, word for word, both in him and Petrie.[2] But what had they to do with the *kings of this world*, especially such *babie kings* as King James then was—they, I say, who had now the government of *Christ's kingdom to settle?* However, no more was done against *Prelacy* at this time than had been ordered formerly. Indeed, there was little more to be done, but to declare the office abolished, but *that* it seems they were not yet *ripe* for. Perchance the *corruptions* mentioned before had proved a little *choaking*, and people's stomachs could not be so soon disposed for another *dish* of such *strong meat* in an instant; so *that* was reserved till the next Assembly. Nevertheless, in the mean time we take notice of one thing which we never heard of before, which started up in this Assembly, and which must not be forgotten. It was proposed by the Synod of Lothian (saith Calderwood)[3]—"That a general order might be taken for erecting of *Presbyteries* in places where public exercise was used, until the *polity* of the Church might be established by law." And it was answered by the Assembly—"*That the Exercise was a Presbytery.*"[4]

A *Presbytery* turned afterwards, and now is, one of the most specific, essential, and indispensible parts of the *Pres-*

Parliament, being summoned thereto, I consider my position as a subject compels me to obey the same, and (that it is) no hurt, but beneficial to the Kirk that some of our number are at the making of good laws and ordinances. In the doing whereof, I protest before God I intend never to do anything but what I believe shall stand with the purity of the Scriptures and a well reformed country; for a good part of the revenue which I enjoy has been given me for that cause." There are some slight verbal variations in the accounts of this reply as given by Calderwood, Petrie, and Spottiswoode, but the above is quoted from the "Booke of the Universall Kirk," Part Second, p. 423.—E.]

[1] Spottiswoode, 303; Calderwood, 84; Petrie, 396.

[2] Calderwood, 86. Petrie, 398.

[3] Calderwood, 88.

[4] MS. Calderwood, 88. Petrie, 400.

byterian constitution. *Provincial Synods* can sit only *twice* in the year, *General Assemblies* only *once*, according to the constitution. It is true, it is allowed to the King to convocate *one* extraordinarily, and *pro re nata*, as they call it; and the *Kirk* claims to have such a power too, as she sees occasion. But, then, it is as true that Kings have been so disgusted at such meetings, that they have hindered General Assemblies[1] to meet for many years; so that their meetings are uncertain, and in innumerable cases there should be too long a *surcease* of *ecclesiastical justice*, if *causes* should wait either on *them*, or *Provincial Synods*. The *Commission of the General Assembly*, as they call it, is but an accidental thing; the sudden dissolution of a General Assembly can disappoint its very being, as just now there is none, nor has been, since the last Assembly,[2] which was so surprisingly dissolved[3] in *February* 1692. When there is such a *court*, it commonly sits but *once* in *three* months, and it meddles not with every matter.

[1] [James VI. would not allow Assemblies to be convoked without his, or his Council's, special license; and during a certain period of his contentions with the Presbyterians—from 1584 to 1586—i. e. for two years, he neither summoned nor would suffer them, though frequently entreated, to meet. His ill-fated son was obliged to dissolve the Assembly of 1638, and while Cromwell ruled Scotland with a rod of iron this Court was prevented from being held. When the Assembly met at Edinburgh in 1653, the Moderator had no sooner ended his opening prayer, than the place of meeting was surrounded by a body of troops under the command of one of Monk's field-officers, who pronounced their sitting illegal, and drove them out of the city. An attempt was made in the succeeding year to get up another Assembly, but as soon as it was discovered, it was suppressed by military interference. From this period, until after the Revolution, there were no General Assemblies in Scotland.—E.]

[2] [In 1693, when our author wrote.—E.]

[3] [It appears that William wished to conciliate the disestablished clergy, and a scheme had been formed between him and a favourite Nobleman for receiving them upon certain terms within the Kirk. An Assembly was called in 1692, and a royal letter read recommending the scheme. One hundred and eighty Episcopal clergymen came forward, prepared to subscribe the terms, but were refused admission, upon which they appealed to the King, who, by his Commissioner, dissolved the Assembly, which was not convoked for more than two years afterwards. This whole affair seems to have been a piece of state policy, conducted upon the principle of expediency, and without scrutinizing too strictly the motives which induced so large a body of clergy to concur in it, we cannot blame the Presbyterian party for their *exclusiveness* in wishing to keep out of their system persons, who might have proved very dangerous members, and had been found tampering with their beloved Parity.—E.]

Besides, many of themselves do not love it, and look upon it as an error in the *custom* of the *Kirk*, for it was never made *part* of the *constitution* by any *canon* of the *Kirk* nor *Act* of Parliament. But a *Presbytery* is a *constant current court.* They may meet when they will, sit while they will, adjourn whither, when, how long, how short time, soever they will. They have all the substantial *power* of government and discipline—they have really a *legislative power*—they can make *acts* to bind themselves, and all those who live within their jurisdiction; and they have a very large *dose* of *executive power;* they can *examine*, *ordain*, *admit*, *suspend*, *depose*, ministers; they can *cite*, *judge*, *absolve*, *condemn*, *excommunicate* whatsoever *criminals.* The *supreme power* of the Church, under Christ, is *radically* and *originally* in them; it is in *General Assemblies* themselves *derivatively* only, and as they *represent* all the *Presbyteries* in the nation. And, if I mistake not, if a General Assembly should enact any thing, and the *greater part* of the *Presbyteries* of the nation should *reprobate* it, it would not be binding; and yet how necessary, how useful, how powerful soever, these Courts are—though they are essential parts of the constitution—though they may be really said to be that which *specifies* Presbyterian government, this *time*, this *seventh*, or *eighth*, or *tenth* of *July* 1579, was the *first* time they were heard of in *Scotland.*

That which was called the *Exercise* before was nothing like a *court*—had no imaginable *jurisdiction*—could neither *enjoin penance* to the *smallest offender*, nor *absolve* him from it. It could exert no acts of authority—it had not so much *power* as the meanest *kirk-session*—it was nothing like a *Presbytery;* and, however it was said in this Assembly, "*that the Exercise was a Presbytery*," yet that saying (as *omnipotent* as a Presbyterian Assembly is) did not make it *one.* That was not a *factive* proposition. There were no *Presbyteries* erected at this time. The *first* that was erected was the *Presbytery* of *Edinburgh;* and, if we may believe Calderwood himself,[1] that Presbytery was not erected till the *thirtieth* day of *May* 1581. More time was run before the rest were erected. They were not agreed to by the King till the year 1586. They were not ratified by Parliament till the year

[1] Calderwood, 116.

1592. And now let the impartial reader judge if it is probable that our Reformers, who never thought on *Presbyteries*, were of the *present Presbyterian principles?* Were they Presbyterians, who never understood—never thought of—never *dreamed* of that which is so *essential* to the constitution of a Church, by *Divine institution*, according to the present Presbyterian principles?

But doth not G[ilbert] R[ule] in his "First Vindication of the Church of Scotland," in answer to the First Question, §. 8, tell us that "the real exercise of Presbytery in all its meetings, lesser and greater, continued, and was allowed, in the year 1572," &c. True, he saith so; but no man but himself ever said so. But I know the *natural history* of this ignorant blunder. His historian Calderwood had said that "the Kirk of Scotland, ever since the beginning, had four sorts of Assemblies,"[1] and this was enough for G[ilbert] R[ule]. For what other could these four sorts of Assemblies be than *Kirk-Sessions*, *Presbyteries*, *Provincial Synods*, and *General Assemblies?* But if he had, with the least degree of any thing like attention, read four or five lines further, he might have seen that Calderwood himself was far from having the *brow* to assert that *Presbyteries* were then in being. For having said there were four sorts of Assemblies from the beginning, he goes on to particularize them thus—"*National*, which were commonly called *General Assemblies; Provincial*, which were commonly called by the general name of *Synods*; *weekly meetings* of ministers and readers for interpretation of the Scripture, whereunto *succeeded Presbyteries*, that is, *meetings of many ministers and elders for the exercise of discipline*, and the *eldership* of every *parish*, which others calls a *Presbytery*." In which account it is evident that he doth not call these *weekly meetings* for interpretation of the Scriptures *Presbyteries*, but says that *Presbyteries succeeded* to these *weekly meetings;* and he gives quite different descriptions of these *weekly meetings* and *Presbyteries*, making the *weekly meetings* to have been "of ministers and elders for the interpretation of Scripture," and *Presbyteries* to have been—as they still are—"meetings of many ministers and elders for the exercise of discipline."

[1] Calderwood, 29.

It is true, he might have as well said that *Presbyteries succeeded* to the *meeting* of the *four* kings against the *five*, or of the *five* against the *four*, mentioned in the 14th chapter of the Book of Genesis, for the meetings of these kings were *before* our *Presbyteries*, I think, in order of time; and these *meetings* of these kings were as much like our *present Presbyteries*, as those meetings were which were appointed at the Reformation for the interpretation of Scripture. So that even Calderwood himself was but *trifling* when he said so. But *trifling* is one thing, and *impudent founding* of *false history* upon another man's *trifling* is another. But enough of this author at present; we shall have further occasions of meeting with him.

This Assembly was also earnest with the King that the "Book of Policy" might be farther considered, and that farther conference might be had about it, that the Heads not agreed about might be compromised some way or other.[1] But the King, it seems, listened not, for they were at it again in their next Assembly. And now that I have so frequently mentioned this "Second Book of Discipline," and shall not have occasion to proceed much further in this wearisome deduction, before I leave it I shall only say this much more about it. As much stress as the Presbyterian party laid on it afterwards, and continue still to lay on it, as if it were so very exact a system of ecclesiastical polity, yet at the beginning the compilers of it had no such confident sentiments about it; for, if we may believe Spottiswoode[2]—and herein he is not contradicted by any Presbyterian historian, when Mr David Lindesay, Mr James Lawson, and Mr Robert Pont, were sent by the Assembly to present it to the Regent Morton in the end of the year 1577—"They intreated his Grace to receive the Articles presented to him, and if any of them did seem not agreeable to reason, to vouchsafe audience to the brethren whom the Assembly had named to attend. Not that they thought it a work complete, to which nothing might be added, or from which nothing might be diminished; for, as God should reveal further unto them, they should be willing to help and renew the same." Now, upon this testimony I found this

[1] MS. Petrie, 399; Calderwood, 87, 88. [2] Spottiswoode, 277.

question—whether the compilers of the "Second Book of Discipline" could in reason have been in earnest that this *Book*, which they acknowledged not to be a work so complete as that nothing could be added to it or taken from it, should have been confirmed by an *oath* and sworn to as an *unalterable rule of policy?* Are they not injurious to them who make them capable of such a *bare-faced* absurdity? Indeed, whatever our present Presbyterians say, and with how great assurance soever they talk to this purpose, this is a demonstration that the compilers of it never intended, nay, could not *intend*, that it should be *sworn* to in the "Negative Confession."[1] That it was not *sworn* to in that "Confession," I think I could prove with as much evidence as the nature of the thing is capable of, if it were needful to my present purpose; but not being that, I shall only give this further demonstration, which comes in here naturally enough, now that we have mentioned this *Book* so often. The "Negative Confession" was *sworn* to and *subscribed* by the *King* and his *Council* upon the 28th of January 1580-1.[2] Upon the *second of March* thereafter the King gave out a *proclamation*, ordering all the subjects to *subscribe* it.[3] But the King

[1] [This was composed by John Craig at the request of the King, and the object of it was to free himself and his household from a charge of "Popery" which had been "got up" against them. The suspicion of Romanizing tendencies arose from the fact of his Majesty having promoted, and admitted to his particular favour, his relative Esme Stuart, Lord Aubigny, who had recently arrived in Scotland from France. This Nobleman, either from conviction, or some other less laudable motive, had, soon after his arrival, publicly embraced the Protestant religion, participated in the Lord's Supper, and subscribed the Confession of Faith of 1560; but this did not satisfy the jealous Reformers, who suspected that the principles of the King were being perverted by his intimacy with the obnoxious Nobleman, and therefore they raised a violent outcry against him. James, foreseeing the evil likely to arise from such suspicions, determined to put the orthodoxy of himself and his friend beyond question, and accordingly ordered his chaplain to draw up a Confession of Faith on the suspected points. This functionary certainly executed his task with much fidelity, for the document which he compiled, while it assailed the Pope, and all the "corruptions of Romanism," was couched in coarse and bitter language, for the obvious purpose of rendering the Royal subscription more marked and undoubted. James and his household signed it, January 28, 1580, and he afterwards recommended it to the consideration of his subjects. It is in the "Book of the Universall Kirk," Part II. p. 515-18, printed for the Bannatyne Club.—E.]

[2] Calderwood, 96.

[3] Calderwood, 97.

had never approven, never owned, but, on the contrary, had constantly rejected, the "Second Book of Discipline." Nay, it was not *ratified*—got not its *finishing stroke* from the *General Assembly*—itself till towards the end of *April* in that year 1581. By necessary consequence, I think, it was not *sworn* to in the "Negative Confession." And thus I leave it. Proceed we now to the next Assembly.

It met at Dundee upon the *twelfth* of *July* 1580, full *twenty* years after the Reformation, for the Parliament which established the Reformation—as the Presbyterian historians are earnest to have it—had its first meeting on the *tenth* of *July* 1560. This—this was the Assembly which, after so many *fencings* and *strugglings*, gave the deadly *thrust* to *Episcopacy*. I shall transcribe its Act word for word from Calderwood, who has exactly enough taken it from the MSS., and both Spottiswoode and Petrie agree.[1] It is this:—

"Forasmuch as the office of a Bishop, as it is now used and commonly taken within this Realm, hath no sure warrant, authority, nor good ground out of the Book and Scriptures of God, but is brought in by the folly and corruptions of men's invention, to the great overthrow of the true Kirk of God; the whole Assembly in one voice, after liberty given to all men to reason in the matter, none opponing themselves in defence of the said pretended office, findeth and declareth the same pretended office, used and termed as is above said, unlawful in the self, as having neither fundament, ground, nor warrant in the Word of God. And ordaineth that all such persons as brook, or hereafter shall brook the said office, be charged *simpliciter* to dimit, quit, and leave off the samine, as an office whereunto they are not called by God; and sicklike to desist and cease from preaching, ministration of the Sacraments, or using any way the office of pastors, while[2] they receive, *de novo*, admission from the General Assembly, under the pain of excommunication to be used against them; wherein, if they be found disobedient, or contravene this Act in any point, the sentence of excommunication, *after due admonition, to be execute against* them."

[1] Calderwood, 90; Spottiswoode, 311; Petrie, 402. [2] [Until.—E.]

This is the Act. Perhaps it were no very great difficulty to impugn the *infallibility* of this *true blue* Assembly, and to expose the boldness, the folly, the iniquity, the preposterous zeal, which are conspicuous in this Act; nay, yet after all this, to shew that the *zealots* for *Parity* had not arrived at that *height* of *effrontery*, as to *condemn* Prelacy as *simply* and in itself unlawful.[1] But by this time, I think, I have performed my promise, and made it appear that it was no *easy* task to *abolish* Episcopacy, and *introduce* Presbytery—to turn down Prelacy, and set up Parity in the government of the Church, when it was first attempted in Scotland. And, therefore, I shall stop here, and bring this long disquisition upon the Second Inquiry to a conclusion, after I have recapitulated, and represented in one entire view, what I have at so great length deduced.

I have made it appear, I think, that no such Article was believed, professed, or maintained by the body of any Reformed or Reforming Church, or by any eminent and famous divine in any Reformed or Reforming Church, while our Church was a-reforming; no such *Article*, I say, as that of the *Divine* and *indispensible institution* of *Parity*, and the *unlawfulness* of *Prelacy* or *imparity* amongst the governors of the Church. I have made it appear that there is no reason

[1] [The author hints at the restricting clause, ("as it is *now* used and commonly taken") with regard to Episcopacy. That this restriction had a *meaning* is evident from the fact that, in the next Assembly held at Glasgow, several brethren expressed their scruples at the sweeping condemnation of Episcopacy as having "*no warrant in the Word of God*," when the Assembly explained that "that their meaning was to condemn the estate of Bishops as they were *then* in Scotland." A venerable historian observes upon this Act—"It was not, therefore, Episcopacy in general, as such, but that particular form and fashion of it, now for political ends erected in Scotland, which even this seemingly Presbyterian Assembly of Dundee condemned, as flowing from the folly and corruption of man's invention, and having no warrant in the Word of God; and, indeed, it will not be easy to prove from Scripture that the office of a Bishop, as there described, could properly and warrantably be exercised by any one at his own hand, without such previous and preparatory solemnity as the canons of Scripture had appointed, and the first ages, in conformity to and interpretation of these canons, had universally and constantly practised. And could the Episcopacy which was at that time used in Scotland, either in the entrance to, or exercise of the office, claim the Apostolic character, or pretend to any Scripture warrant?" Skinner's Ecclesiastical History, vol. ii. pp. 210, 211.—E.]

to believe that our Reformers were more *prying* in such matters than the Reformers of other Churches. I have made it appear that there is not so much as a syllable, a shew, a shadow of an indication, that any of those who *merited* the *name* of *our Reformers* entertained any such principle, or maintained any such Article. I have made it appear that our Reformation was carried on, much, very much, by the *influences* and upon the *principles* of the *English Reformers*, amongst whom that principle of *Parity* had no imaginable *footing*. These are, at least, great *presumptions* of the credibility of this, that our Reformers maintained no such principle.

Agreeably to these *presumptions*, I have made it appear that our Reformers proceeded *de facto* upon the *principles of Imparity*. They formed their *petitions* for the reformation of our Church according to these *principles*. The *first scheme* of church government they erected was established upon these principles. Our *Superintendents* were notoriously and undeniably *Prelates*; the *next* establishment, in which the *Prelates* resumed the *old names* and *titles* of *Archbishops* and *Bishops*, was the same for substance with the first, at least they did not *differ* as to the point of *Imparity*. I have made it appear that this *second* establishment was agreed to by the Church unanimously, and submitted to calmly and peaceably, and that it was received as an establishment which was intended to continue in the Church; at least no *objections* made against it, no *appearances* in opposition to it, no *indications* of its being accepted only for an *interim*, upon the account of *Imparity* being in its constitution. I have made it appear that *Imparity* was received, practised, owned, and submitted to, and that *Prelates* were suitably honoured and dutifully obeyed, without reluctancy, and without interruption, for full *fifteen* years after the Reformation. And I have made it appear that after it was called in question, its adversaries found many repulses, and mighty difficulties, and spent much travel, and much time, no less than full *five* years, before they could get it abolished. And if the deduction I have made puts not this beyond all doubt, it may be further confirmed by the testimonies of *two* very intelligent authors. The first is that ingenious and judicious author who wrote the accurate piece called "Episcopacy not Abjured in Scotland. published anno 1640," who affirms

positively[1]—"that it was by reason of opposition made to the Presbyterians, by many wise, learned, and godly brethren, who stood firmly for the ancient discipline of the Church, that Episcopacy was so long a condemning." It appears from his elaborate work, that he was an *ingenuous* as well as an *ingenious* person, and living then, and having been at so much pains to inform himself concerning not only the *transactions* but the *intrigues* of former times, it is to be presumed, he did not affirm such a proposition without sufficient ground. But whatever *dust* may be raised about his *credit* and *authority*, sure I am my other witness is unexceptionable. He is King *James* the *Sixth* of *Scotland* and the *First* of *England*. This great and wise Prince lived in these times in which *Presbytery* was *first* introduced, and I think it is scarcely to be questioned that he understood and could give a just account of what passed then, as well as any man then living; and he, in his "Basilicon Doron,"[2] affirms plainly that "the learned, grave, and honest men of the ministry, were ever ashamed of, and offended with, the temerity and presumption" of the democratical and Presbyterian party. All these things, I say, I think I have made appear sufficiently; and so I am not afraid to leave it to the world to judge *whether our Reformers were of the present Presbyterian principles?*

Only one thing more, before I proceed to the next Inquiry. Our Presbyterian brethren, Calderwood, Petrie, and G[ilbert] R[ule], as I have already observed, are very earnest and careful to have their readers advert, that when Episcopacy was established by the Agreement at Leith, anno 1572, the *Bishops* were to have no more power than the *Superintendents* had before; and, indeed, it is true, they had no more, as I have already acknowledged, but I would advise our brethren to be more cautious in insisting on such a dangerous point, or *glorying* in such a *discovery* hereafter. For thus I argue:—

The "Episcopacy agreed to at Leith," anno 1572, as to its *essentials*, its *power*, and *authority*, was the same with the *Superintendency* established at the Reformation, anno 1560. But the General Assembly holden at Dundee, anno 1580,

[1] P. 97.—[John Maxwell, Bishop of Ross.—E.]

[2] P. 160 of his Works, printed at London, 1616.

condemned the *power* and *authority* of the *Episcopacy* agreed to at Leith, anno 1572. *Ergo*, they *condemned* the *power* and *authority* of the *Superintendency* established by our Reformers, anno 1560. *Ergo*, the Assembly, 1580, not only *forsook* but *condemned* the *principles* of *our Reformers*. But if this reasoning holds, I think our *present Presbyterian* brethren have no reason to claim the title of *successors to our Reformers*. They must not *ascend* so high as the year 1560—they must *stand* at the year 1580; for, if I mistake not, the laws of heraldry will not allow them to call themselves the *true* posterity of *those* whom they condemn, and *whose* principles *they* declare erroneous. In such *moral cognations* I take *oneness* of *principle* to be the *foundation* of the *relation*, as *oneness* of *blood* is in *physical cognations*. Let them not, therefore, go farther up than the year 1580—let them *date* the Reformation from this Assembly at Dundee, and *own Mr Andrew Melville* and *John Durie*,[1] &c. for their *first parents*. When they have *fixed* there, I shall, perchance, allow them to affirm that the Church of Scotland was reformed (in their sense of reformation) by *Presbyters*, that is, *Presbyterians*. Proceed we now to

THE THIRD INQUIRY—WHETHER PRELACY, AND THE SUPERIORITY OF ANY OFFICE IN THE CHURCH ABOVE PRESBYTERS, WAS A GREAT AND INSUPPORTABLE GRIEVANCE AND TROUBLE TO THIS NATION, AND CONTRARY TO THE INCLINATIONS OF THE GENERALITY OF THE PEOPLE, *EVER* SINCE THE REFORMATION?

CONSIDERING what hath been discoursed so fully on the former Inquiry, this may be very soon dispatched; for, if "Prelacy, and the superiority of other officers in the Church

[1] [These were the individuals who first attacked Episcopacy in 1575. Durie was the tool of Melville, who had imbibed his notions of Parity during his residence at Geneva, where he had associated with Calvin and Beza, and having borrowed from them the Presbyterian polity, he introduced it into his native land. It is, therefore, of *foreign origin*, and people greatly mistake when they allow the advocates of Presbyterianism to delude themselves and others by ascribing to it greater antiquity than it deserves, and investing it with a *national character*. IT WAS GENERATED IN GENEVA, AND TRANSPLANTED INTO SCOTLAND BY MELVILLE IN 1580.—E.]

above Presbyters," was so unanimously consented to and established at the Reformation—if it continued to be owned, revered, and submitted to by pastors and people without interruption—without being ever called in question for full *fifteen* years after the Reformation—if after it was *called in question* its adversaries found it so hard a task to subvert it, that they spent five years more, before they could get it *subverted* and declared *unlawful*, even as it was then in Scotland—if these things are true, I say I think it is not *very credible* that it was "a great and insupportable grievance and trouble to this nation, and contrary to the inclinations of the generality of the people *ever* since the Reformation." This collection I take to be as clear a demonstration as the subject is capable of. But beside this, we have the clear and consentient testimonies of historians to this purpose.

Petrie[1] delivers it thus—"Mercy and truth, righteousness and peace, had never, since Christ's coming in the flesh, a more glorious meeting and amiable embracing on earth; even so, that the Church of *Scotland* justly obtained a name amongst the chief churches and kingdoms of the world—the hottest persecutions had not greater purity—the most *halcyon* times had not more prosperity and peace—the best Reformed Churches in other places scarcely paralleled their liberty and unity." Spottiswoode[2] thus—"The Superintendents were in such respect with all men, as, notwithstanding the dissensions that were in the country, no exception was taken at their proceedings by any of the parties, but all concurred in the maintenance of religion, and in the treaties of peace made, that was ever one of the Articles; such a reverence was in those times carried to the Church, the very form of government purchasing them respect." I might also cite Beza himself to this purpose, in his letter to John Knox, dated Geneva, April 12, 1572, wherein he congratulates heartily the happy and *united* state of the Church of *Scotland*. Perhaps it might be no difficult task to adduce more testimonies; but the truth is, no man can read the histories and monuments of these times, without being convinced that this is true, and that there cannot be

[1] Petrie, ad anno 1576, page 352.
[2] Spottiswoode, ad anno 1571, page 258.

a falser proposition, than " that Prelacy was such a grievance then, or so contrary to the inclinations of the generality of the people."

Further, even in succeeding times—even after it was condemned by that Assembly, 1580—it cannot be proven that it was such a " grievance" to the " nation." It is true, indeed, some *hot-headed* Presbyterian preachers endeavoured all they could to possess the people with an opinion of its *Antichristianism*, forsooth, and that it was a brat of the *whore*, a limb of *Popery*, and what not? But all this time no account of the " inclinations of the generality of the people" against it. On the contrary, nothing more evident in history, even Calderwood's History, than that there was no such thing. Is it not obviously observable, even in *that* History, that after the civil government took some twelve or fourteen of the most forward of these brethren, who kept the pretended Assembly at Aberdeen,[1] anno 1605, a little roundly to *task*, and some six or eight more were called by the King to attend his will at London, all things went very peaceably in Scotland? Was not Episcopacy restored by the General Assembly at Glasgow, anno 1610, with *very great unanimity?* Of more than one *hundred* and *seventy voices*, there were only *five negative*, and *seven non liquet*. Nay, Calderwood himself hath recorded, that even these ministers who went to London, after their return submitted peaceably to the then *established Prelacy*. And there are few things more observable in his Book than his *grudge* that there should have been such a *general defection* from the *good cause*. Indeed, I have not observed, no, not in his History, that there were six in all the kingdom who, from the establishment of Episcopacy, anno 1610, did not attend at *Synods*, and submit to their *Ordinaries*. I do not remember any except two—Calderwood himself, and one Johnstone at Anerum, and even these two pretended other reasons than *scruple* of conscience for their *withdrawing*.

[1] [This Assembly consisted of *nineteen* ministers, who sat in direct opposition to the Royal authority, by which their meeting had been dissolved. Some of them were afterwards tried for high treason, and being convicted, were committed to prison, and finally banished. Others, among whom were Andrew Melville and his nephew James Melville, were summoned a few months after to London to the Hampton Court Conference.—E.]

It is further observable, that the *stirs* which were made after the Assembly at Perth, anno 1618, were not pretended to be upon the account of Episcopacy. Those of the gang could not prevail, it seems, with the "generality of the people" to *tumultuate* on that account. All that was pretended were the "Perth Articles."[1] Neither did the *humour* against these "Articles" prevail much, or far, all the time King James lived, nor for the first *twelve* years of King Charles, his son and successor. It fell asleep, as it were, till the

[1] [These injunctions were five in number :—"I. Kneeling at the reception of the Eucharist. II. The administration of the Holy Communion to the sick, dying, or infirm persons, in their houses, in cases of urgent necessity. III. The administration of Baptism in private, under similar circumstances. IV. Confirmation by the Bishop. V. The observance of the Festivals relating to our blessed Saviour, and the great events in the fulfilment of our redemption—the Birth, Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension of our Lord, and the effusion of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost. These Articles made much noise at the time, and encountered a strong opposition, as things absolutely "Popish" and wicked. But the prejudice against the practices which they enjoin is rapidly passing away from the minds of Scottish Presbyterians. Their ministers now perform Baptisms privately without any reluctance ; they regret that it is not permitted them to set before the sick and dying the visible symbols of "Christ crucified," and to administer to their fainting souls the blessed "medicine of immortality." Indeed, it is related by Mr Scott, in his MS. Extracts from the Kirk-Session Records of Perth—"I have heard of its being given by a minister of our Church in the South of Scotland. The Presbytery to which he belongs have not inflicted any censure upon him, nor does it seem to be the resolution of the church judicatories generally, to take any notice of it ;" and it has been stated to the present Editor, that within the last six years a Presbyterian divine in Glasgow did, in this particular, charitably overstep the restrictions of his Kirk. With respect to the observation of Festivals, it is generally admitted by the best informed among them, that in this their system is extremely defective, and they endeavour to supply the defect by regulating their sermons according to the subjects suggested by the several seasons and institutions of the Catholic ritual. One of the most eminent of the present ministers of Edinburgh is famed for his singular care in adapting his discourses at the several commemorative seasons to the subjects suggested by the English Book of Common Prayer—a praise-worthy attempt on his part to rectify the isolation of Presbyterianism, and to realize the "Communion of Saints." The case of this talented metropolitan preacher is by no means singular. There are others within the Scottish Establishment of the same *πάθος*, who are regarded with suspicion by their more rigid brethren, and whose fondness for liturgical institutions and language has caused them to be viewed as leaning towards the "*Church of England*."—E.]

clamours against the Liturgy and Book of Canons *awakened* it, anno 1637, and all that time—I mean from the year 1610, that Episcopacy was restored, till the year 1637, that the *Covenanting work* was set on foot, Prelacy was so far from being "a great and insupportable grievance and trouble to this nation, and contrary to the inclinations of the generality of the people," that, on the contrary, it was not only generally submitted to, but in very good esteem. Indeed, it is certain the nation had never more peace, more concord, more plenty, more profound quiet and prosperity, than in that interval. Let no man reckon of these things as naked assertions—I can prove them; and hereby I undertake (with God's allowance and assistance) to prove all I have said, and more if I shall be put to it. But I think my cause requires not that it should be done at present. Nay, further yet, I do not think it were an insuperable task if I should undertake to maintain, that when the *Covenanting politic* was set on foot, anno 1637, Prelacy was no "such grievance" to the nation. This I am sure of, it was not the contrariety of the generality of the people's inclinations to Prelacy that first gave life and motion to that *monstrous confederation*. Sure I am, it was pretty far advanced before the *leading confederates* offered to fix on Prelacy, as one of their reasons for it—so very sure, that it is easy to make it appear that they were afraid of nothing more than that "the generality of the people" should *smell* it out—that they had *designs* to overturn Episcopacy. How often did they *protest* to the Marquis of Hamilton, then the King's Commissioner, that their meaning was not to *abolish* Episcopal government?[1] How *frank* were they to tell those whom they were earnest to *cajole* into their *Covenant*, that they might very well *swear* it without prejudice to Episcopacy?[2] Nay, how forward

[1] See Large Declaration, 114, 115.

[2] Ibid. 69 and 173.—["As to the National Covenant itself, although its object could not be misunderstood, it contains no direct denial of the Royal authority and the Episcopal government of the Church. This obtained for it signatures from many who were opposed to violent measures, and who never contemplated the overthrow of Episcopacy. In a letter to Principal Strang of Glasgow, who had signed it—'so far as that it was not prejudicial to the King's authority, the office of Episcopal government itself, and that power which is given to Bishops by lawful Assemblies and Parliaments,' Baillie says—'If ye saw any thing into this Covenant which, either in

were the *Presbyterian* ministers themselves to *propagate* this *pretence?* When the Doctors of Aberdeen told the *three*,[1] who were sent to that city to procure subscriptions, that they could not swear the *Covenant* because *Episcopacy* was *abjured* in it, are not these Henderson's and Dickson's very words in their "Answer" to the "Fourth Reply."—"You will have all the Covenanters, against their intention, and whether they will or not, to disallow and condemn the Articles of *Perth* and Episcopal government; but it is known to many hundreds that the words were purposely conceived, for satisfaction of such as were of your judgment, that we might all join in one heart and covenant?" Many more things might be readily adduced to prove this more fully, but it is needless; for what can be more fairly colligible from any thing than it is from this *specimen*, that it was their *fear* that they might *miss* of their *mark*, and not get the people to join with them in their *Covenant*, if it should be so soon discovered that they *aimed* at the *overthrow* of Episcopacy.

It is true, indeed, after they had by such disingenuous and *Jesuitish fetches* gained numbers to their party, and got many well meaning ministers and people engaged in their *rebellious* and *schismatical confederacy*, they took off the *mask*, and condemned Episcopacy in their *packed Assembly*, anno 1638, declaring, with more than *Jesuitish impudence*, that, notwithstanding of their protestations so frequently and publicly made to the contrary, it was *abjured* in their *Covenant*. And yet I dare advance this *paradox*, that even then it was not an "insupportable grievance" to the *Presbyterians* themselves, far less to the whole *nation*. I own this to be a *paradox*, and, therefore, I must ask my reader's allowance to give my reason for which I have dared to advance it. It is this.

express terms, or by any good consequence, could infer the contradiction of any of those things ye name, ye might not in any terms, on any exposition or limitation, offer to subscribe it.' He declares that *he* could see no word in it against the King's 'full authority,' or 'against the office of Bishops,' and that he had often publicly professed *this* his belief 'without the least appearance of contradiction.'" Lawson's Episcopal Church of Scotland from the Reformation to the Revolution, p. 545-6.—E.]

[1] [Dickson, Henderson, and Cant, who were in consequence called "the three Apostles of the Covenant!"—E.]

Considering how much Prelacy *affects* the Church as a *society*—of how great consequence it is in the *concerns* of the Church, whatever it is in itself, it cannot in reason be called an "insupportable grievance" to such as are *satisfied* they can live *safely* and without *sin* in the communion of that Church where it prevails. If such can call it a "grievance" at all, I think they cannot justly call it *more* than a "supportable grievance;" I think it cannot be justly called an "insupportable grievance," till it can *justify*, and by consequence *necessitate* a *separation* from that Church which has *it* in its constitution. How can that be called an "insupportable grievance," especially in Church matters, where *grievance* and *corruption* (if I take them right, must be terms very much equivalent), to those who can *safely support* it, i. e. live under it *without sin*, and with a *safe conscience*, continue in the Church's communion while *it* is in the Church's government? How can that be called "insupportable" which is not of such malignity in a Church as to make her communion sinful? How can that be called "insupportable," in *ecclesiastical* concerns or *religious* matters, to those who are persuaded they may *bear* it, or *with* it, without disturbing their *inward peace*, or endangering their *eternal interests?* Now, such in these times were all the Presbyterians, at least generally in the nation. They did not think upon *breaking* the communion of the Church, upon *separating* from the solemn assemblies under Prelacy, and setting up *Presbyterian altars* in opposition to the Episcopal altars. They still kept up *one communion* in the nation; they did not refuse to join in the *public ordinances*, the solemn worship of God, and the *Sacraments*, with their *Prelatic* brethren. All this is so well known, that none I think will call it in question. Indeed that *height* of *antipathy* to Prelacy had not prevailed amongst the party, no, not when Episcopacy had its *fetters* struck off, anno 1662, for then, and for some years after, the Presbyterians generally, both pastors and people, kept the *unity* of the Church, and *joined* with the conformists in the public ordinances; and I believe there are hundreds of thousands in Scotland who remember very well how short a time it is since they betook themselves to *conventicles*, and turned avowed *schismatics*. I confess the reasoning I have just now insisted on cannot militate so *patly* against such, for if

they had reason to *separate*, they had the same reason to call Prelacy an "insupportable grievance"—no more and no other. But I cannot see how the *force* of it can be well avoided by them in respect of their predecessors, who had not the *boldness* to *separate* upon the account of Prelacy.

But it may be said, that those Presbyterians who lived anno 1637, and downward, *shook off* Prelacy, and would *bear* it no longer; and was it not then an "insupportable grievance" to them? True, indeed, for removing the *pretended* corruptions of Prelacy, they then ventured upon the *really* horrid sin of rebellion against their Prince—they embroiled three famous and flourishing kingdoms—they broke down the beautiful and ancient structures of government both in Church and State—they shed oceans of Christian blood and made the nations welter in gore—they gave up themselves to all the wildnesses of rage and fury—they gloried in treason and treachery, in oppression and murder, in fierceness and unbridled tyranny—they drenched innumerable misled souls in the crimson guilt of schism and sedition, of rebellion and faction, of perfidy and perjury. In short, they opened the way to such an inundation of hypocrisy and irreligion, of confusions and calamities, as cannot easily be paralleled in history. And for all these things they *pretended* their *antipathies* to Prelacy! And yet, after all this, I am where I was. Considering their aforesaid principles and practices as to the *unity* of the Church, they could not call it an "insupportable grievance." They did not truly *find* it *such*. Had they really and sincerely, in true Christian simplicity and sobriety, found or felt it such, they would no doubt have looked on it as a *forcible ground* for separating from the communion in which it prevailed, as the Protestants in Germany found their *centum gravamina* for separating from the Church of Rome. To have made it that, indeed, and then to have "suffered patiently," if they had been persecuted for it, without turning to the *antichristian course* of *armed resistance*, had had some *colour* of an argument that they deemed it an "insupportable grievance." But the *fiercest fighting* against it, so long as they could allow themselves to *live* in the communion which *owned* it, can never infer that it was to them an "insupportable grievance." At most, if it was, it was to *wanton humour* and *wildfire* only,

and not to *conscience* and real Christian *conviction*. And so I leave this argument.

I could easily insist more largely on this Inquiry, but to avoid tediousness I shall advance only *one* thing more. It is a *challenge* to my Presbyterian brethren to produce but *one public deed*—one solemn or considerable appearance of the nation, taken either *collectively* or *representatively*, which by any tolerable construction or interpretation can import that "Prelacy, or the superiority of any office in the Church above Presbyters, was a great and insupportable grievance and trouble to this nation, and contrary to the inclinations of the generality of the people" for full *thirty* years after the Reformation.

The learned G[ilbert] R[ule] thought he had found one indeed, it seems, for he introduced it very *briskly* in his "First Vindication of the Church of Scotland," in answer to the First Question, § 9. Hear him :—"It is evident" (says he) "that Episcopal jurisdiction over the Protestants was condemned by law in that same Parliament, 1567, wherein the Protestant religion was established." What? No less than evident! Let us try this parliamentary condemnation.—"It is there statute and ordained, that no other jurisdiction ecclesiastical be acknowledged within this Realm than that which is, and shall be, within this same Kirk established presently, or which floweth therefrom, concerning preaching the Word, correcting of manners, administration of Sacraments." So he. No man who knows this author, and his *way* of writing, will readily think it was ill manners to examine whether he cited right. I turned over, therefore, all the Acts of that Parliament which are in print—and I think his citation shall scarcely be found amongst the unprinted ones—but could not find this citation of our author's. What was next to be done? I knew that full well. I turned to the 43d page of *his* historian Calderwood, and there I found it word for word. Well! But is there no such period to be found in the Acts of that Parliament? Not one, indeed. It is true there is an Act, the *sixth* in number, intituled—"Anent the true and holy Kirk, and of them that are declared to be of the same;" which Act I find insisted on by the Covenanters, anno 1638, in their Answer to the Marquis of Hamilton's Declaration at Edinburgh, in December

that year—as is to be seen in the Large Declaration[1]—as condemning Episcopacy. It is very probable this might be the Act Calderwood thought he abridged in these words borrowed from him by G[ilbert] R[ule]. I shall set it down, word for word, that the world may judge if Episcopacy is condemned by it.[2]

"Forasmuch as the ministers of the blessed Evangel of Jesus Christ, whom God of His mercy hath now raised up amongst us, or hereafter shall raise, agreeing with them who now live in doctrine and administration of the Sacraments (as in the Reformed Kirks of this Realm they are publicly administrate) according to the Confession of Faith; our Sovereign Lord, with advice of my Lord Regent and the three Estates of this present Parliament, has declared, and declares, the aforesaid persons to be the only true and holy Kirk of Jesus Christ within this Realm; and decerns and declares, that all and sundry, who either gainsay the Word of the Evangel, received and approved, as the heads of the Confession of Faith professed in Parliament before in the year of God 1560 years, as also specified in the Acts of this Parliament more particularly doth express, and now ratified and approved in this present Parliament, or that refuses the participation of the holy Sacraments, as they are now ministrate, to be no members of the said Kirk within this Realm presently professed, so long as they keep themselves so divided from the society of Christ's body."

This is the Act. Now here not one word of *ecclesiastical jurisdiction* either foreign or domestic—not one word of *any jurisdiction* within this realm, or in the Kirk within this

[1] P. 352.—["Large Declaration concerning the late Tumults in Scotland, together with a Particular Deduction of the Seditious Practices of the prime Leaders of the Covenant," by Dr Walter Balcanqual, Dean of Rochester, afterwards of York. He was one of the executors appointed by the excellent George Heriot for carrying out his designs with regard to the Hospital which bears his name, and his main object in visiting Edinburgh at this time was to lay the foundation stone of that noble Institution.—E.]

[2] [The "Acta Parl. Scot." which are before the Editor, differ slightly from this printed excerpt. After the clause "agreeing with them who now live in doctrine," follows—["and the pepil of this Realm that profess Jesus Christ as he is now offered in his Evangel, and do communicate with the Haly Sacraments"] "as in the Reformed Kirks." The words within brackets are not in this excerpt.—E.]

realm, or that should *ever flow* from the said Kirk—not one word of *correcting of manners*. From which it is evident that if this was the Act Calderwood aimed at, he gave the world a very *odd* abridgement of it. And G[ilbert] R[ule] should consider things a little better, and not take them upon trust, to found arguments on them so ridiculously.

But doth not this Act condemn Episcopacy? Let the world judge if it doth. What can be more plain than that all this Act aims at is only to *define* that Church which then was to have the legal establishment, and the countenance of the civil authority? This Church it *defines* to be that society of pastors and people which professed the doctrine of the Evangel, &c. according to the Confession of Faith then established. It is plain, I say, this is all that Act aims at. Not one word of *jurisdiction* or *discipline*, of *government* or *polity*, of *Episcopacy* or *Presbytery*, of *Prelacy* or *Parity*, of *equality* or *inequality*, amongst the governors of the Church. Whatever the *form* of government was then in the Church, or whatever it might be afterwards, was all *one* to this Act, so long as *pastors*—whether acting in *Parity* or *Imparity*—and *people* kept by the same *Rule* of faith, and the same *manner* of administering the Sacraments. What is there here like a *condemnation* of Episcopal *jurisdiction?* Is this the way of *parliamentary condemnations*, to *condemn* an office, or an order, or a jurisdiction—call it as you will—without either naming it, or describing it in terms so circumstantiated, as the world might understand by them that it was meant? To *condemn* a thing, especially a thing of so great importance, without so much as repealing any one of many Acts which established or ratified it before? Surely if this Act condemned Episcopacy, this Parliament happened upon a *new stile*, a *singular stile*, a *stile* never used *before*, never used *since*. Besides, if this was the Act G[ilbert] R[ule] intended, I would earnestly desire him to name but any *one man* who lived in these times, and understood *Episcopacy* to have been *condemned* by this Act. How *blind* was Master Andrew Melville? How *blind* was all the Presbyterian *fraternity*, that, all the *five years* they were fighting against Prelacy, could never hit on this Act, and prove that it ought to be no longer tolerated, seeing it was against an Act of Parliament? Were they so little careful of Acts of Parliament, that they would

not have been at pains to cite them for their purpose? Mr Andrew Melville, in his so often mentioned letter to Beza, dated November 13, 1579, writes thus—"We have not ceased these five years to fight against pseudo-Episcopacy (many of the Nobility resisting us), and to press the severity of Discipline.—We have many of the Peers against us, for they allege, if pseudo-Episcopacy be taken away, one of the Estates is pulled down," &c. Now, how easy had it been for him to have stopt the *mouths* of these *Peers*, by telling them that it was taken away already by this Act of Parliament? What a *dunce* was the Lord Glammis, Chancellor of Scotland (by consequence one obliged by his station to understand something, I think, of the laws of the nation), and all those whom he consulted about the letter he wrote to the same Beza, that neither *he* nor *they* knew any thing of this Act of Parliament, but told the gentleman bluntly, that "Episcopacy[1] subsisted by law; that the Prelates made one of the three Estates; that nothing could be done in Parliament without them; and that the legal establishment of the Order, and its lying so very near the foundation of the civil constitution, made it extremely dangerous to alter it, far more to abolish it?" But what needs more? Let the reader cast back his eyes on the Articles agreed on betwixt the Church, and the Nobility and Barons, in July 1567 that same year, by which it was provided that all the Popish Bishops should be deprived, and that Superintendents should succeed in their places. And then let him consider if it be probable that Episcopacy was condemned by this Act of Parliament.

But G[ilbert] R[ule] continues:—"I hope," says he, "none will affirm that Prelatical jurisdiction then was, or was soon after, established in the Protestant Church of Scotland." Was not our author pretty forward at *hoping?* Will none affirm it? I do affirm it. And I do affirm that if our author had but looked to the very next Act of that Parliament—the *seventh* in number, nay, if he had but cast his

[1] Leges Regni longo usu et inveterata consuetudine receptæ, ut quoties de rebus ad reipublicæ salutem pertinentibus in publicis Regni Comitiis agitur, nihil sine Episcopis constitui potest, quum ipsi tertium Ordinem et Regni Statum efficiant, quem aut mutare, aut prorsus tollere, reipublicæ admodum esset periculosum.

eye some *ten lines* upward in that same 43d page of Calderwood's History, he would have seen the *Prelacy* of *Superintendents* expressly *owned*, and supposed in being, by an Act of that same Parliament, in the matter of granting *collations* upon *presentations*. And now I leave it to the world to judge if G[ilbert] R[ule] has not been very happy at citing Acts of Parliaments against Prelacy! But being thus engaged with him about Acts of Parliament, I hope it will be a pardonable digression though I give the world another instance of his *skill* and *confidence* that way.

The author of the "Ten Questions" had said (in his discussion of the First Question), that "the Popish Bishops sat in the Parliament which settled the Reformation"—a *matter of fact* so distinctly delivered by Knox, Spottiswoode, and Petrie (but passed over by Calderwood), that nothing could be more unquestionable. Nay, even Leslie himself has it, for he tells us that the *three Estates convened*,[1] and I think in those days the *Ecclesiastical Estate* was *one*—the *first* of the *three:* I think also *that Estate* was generally *Popish*. Yet, however plain and indisputable this *matter of fact* was, our learned author could contradict it. Take his answer in his own words—"To what he saith of the Popish Bishops sitting in a reforming Parliament,[2] I oppose what Leslie, Bishop of Ross, a Papist hath, *De Gestis Scotorum*, Lib. 10, page 536, that—Concilium a sectæ Nobilibus cum Regina habitum nullo Ecclesiastico admisso, ubi Sancitum, ne quis quod ad Religionem attinet, quicquam novi moliretur; ex hac lege (inquit) omne sive hæreseos, sive inimicitiarum, sive seditionis malum, tanquam ex fonte fluxit." Now, in the first place, I think it might be made a question for what reason our author changed Leslie's words. Might he not have given us the citation just as it was? Leslie has it thus—"Conveni-

[1] Incunte Augusto, Edinburgum convocati sunt tres Regni Ordines. Lesly, 529.

[2] [There can be no question about this. The names of Bishops are on the roll of the Parliament of 1560 which overthrew the Church. In that of 1567 the Archbishop of St Andrews, the Bishops of Dunkeld, Galloway, Dunblane, Brechin, Orkney, Aberdeen, and Ross, were present; and even in 1568, after Protestantism was established, they had not been ejected, for we find the Bishop of Moray (Hepburn) in his place, and chosen to be one of the Lords of the Articles on the Spiritual side, together with the apostate Bishop of Orkney.—E.]

entibus interim undique sectæ Nobilibus Concilium, nullo Ecclesiastico viro admisso, *Edinburgi*, initur. In eo Concilio in primis sancitum est, ne quis, quod ad religionem attineret, quicquam novi moliretur. Sed res in eo duntaxat statu quo erant, cum Regina ipsa in Scotiam primum appulisset, integræ manerent. Ex hac lege, tanquam fonte, omne sive harescos, sive inimicitiarum, sive seditionis malum in Scotia nostra fluxit." Because Leslie was a Papist, must his very *Latin* be *reformed?* If this was it, if I mistake not, a further reformation may be needful; for if Leslie was wrong in saying *in eo concilio*, I think our author has mended it but *sorrily* by putting *ubi* in its stead, i. e. by making an *adverb* of *place* the *relative* to *concilium;* and let the critics judge whether G[ilbert] R[ule's] *attinet* or Leslie's *attineret* was most proper. But perhaps the true reason was that there was something dark in these words—"Sed res in eo duntaxat statu quo erant, cum Regina ipsa in Scotiam primum appulisset, integræ manerent." It is true, indeed, this sentence quite subverts our author's purpose, for it imports that there had been some certain sort of establishment of religion before the Queen came to Scotland, which was not judged fit then to be altered. Now, that this learned man may be no more puzzled with such an *obscure piece* of history, I will endeavour to help him with a *clue*. Be it known to all men, therefore, and particularly to G[ilbert] R[ule], the learned and renowned "Vindicator" of the Church of Scotland, that the Parliament which established the Reformation, and in which the *Popish* Bishops sat, was holden in *August* 1560—that *Queen Mary returned* not to *Scotland* till *August* 1561—that this *Council*, which *Leslie* speaks of, met after the *Queen's return*, as is evident from *Leslie's* words—and that it was at most but a *Privy Council*, and nothing like a *Parliament*. Have we not G[ilbert] R[ule] now a very accurate historian? And so I leave him for a little, and proceed to the

FOURTH INQUIRY—WHETHER PRELACY, AND THE SUPERIORITY OF ANY OFFICE IN THE CHURCH, ABOVE PRESBYTERS, WAS A GREAT AND INSUPPORTABLE GRIEVANCE AND TROUBLE TO THIS NATION, AND CONTRARY TO THE INCLINATIONS OF THE

GENERALITY OF THE PEOPLE, WHEN THIS ARTICLE WAS ESTABLISHED IN THE CLAIM OF RIGHT?

This Inquiry is about a very recent matter of fact. The subject will not allow of metaphysical arguments. It is not old enough to be determined by the testimonies of historians. It cannot be decided by the public records or *deeds* of the nation; for, if I mistake not, there was never public deed before, founded mainly, and in express terms, upon the "inclinations of the generality of the people;" and I do not think it necessary, by the laws of disputation, that I should be bound by the authority of a *public deed*, which I make the main thing in question. The method, therefore, which I shall take for discussing this Inquiry, shall be to give a plain historical narration of the *rise* and *progress* of this controversy, and consider the arguments made use of on both sides, leaving it to the reader to judge whither side can pretend to the greater probability. The controversy as I take it had its *rise* thus:—

The Scottish Presbyterians, seasonably forewarned of the then P[rince] of O[range]'s designs to possess himself of the crowns of Great Britain and Ireland, against his coming had adjusted their methods for advancing their interests in such a juncture, and getting their beloved *Parity* established in the Church. They were no sooner assured that he was in successful circumstances, than they resolved on putting their projects in execution. The first step was in a *hurry* to raise the *rabble* in the *Western* counties against the Episcopal clergy, thereby to *confound* and put all things in *disorder*. The next, it seems, amidst such confusion, to endeavour by all means to have themselves elected members for the Meeting of Estates, which was to be at Edinburgh upon the 14th of March 1688-9.[1] In both steps the success answered their wishes, and it happened that they got, indeed, the prevailing *sway* in the meeting; and in *gratitude* to the rabble which had done them so surprising service, they resolved not only to set up Presbytery, but to set it up on this *foot*—"That Prelacy was a great and insupport-

[1] [The famous Convention of Estates, from which the Viscount Dundee retired on account of the plot formed against his life.—E.]

able grievance and trouble to the nation, and contrary to the inclinations of the generality of the people."

If this was not *it* that determined them to *set up* their government on this *foot*, I protest I cannot conjecture what it might be that did it. Sure I am, there was no other thing done then that, with the least show of probability, could be called an indication of the "inclinations of the people." They could not collect it from any clamours made at that time against Prelacy by the "generality of the people." There were no such clamours in the mouths of the *twentieth part* of the *people*. They could not collect it from the *people's* separation from the Episcopal clergy during the time of King James's Toleration. The *tenth part* of the *nation* had not *separated*. They could not collect it from any *covetous* disposition they could reasonably imagine was in "the generality of the people," to make themselves *rich* by possessing themselves of the *revenues* of *Bishopricks*. They could not but know that L.6000 or L.7000 sterling was a sorry morsel for so many appetites; and they could not but know, that when *Prelacy* should be abolished, *few*, and but a *very few*, could find advantage that way. They could not collect it from any suspicions *the people* could possibly entertain, that the *Bishops* or the *Episcopal clergy* were inclining to turn *Papists*. They could not but know that *such* had very far outdone the *Presbyterian preachers*[1] in their appearances against Popery. The members of that Meeting of Estates had received no instructions from their respective

[1] It is well known that in the famous address of the Presbyterians to King James, although the Act of Toleration granted by it was an infringement of the law, for *obvious reasons* they were silent about the threatened increase of "Popery," and cautiously waived the delicate point in order to avoid giving offence. In this respect they imitated the "wisdom of the serpent," but whether their silence is reconcileable with the principles of common honesty is quite another thing. They were *gainers* by the Indulgence, and for the moment forgot to raise their *(at other times) loud* testimony against the "corruptions of Rome." Their temporizing behaviour is singularly contrasted with the dignified opposition which the Scottish Prelates evinced towards the royal endeavours to have the Penal Laws repealed, which brought upon them the exercise of the King's severity, and caused Bruce, Bishop of Dunkeld, to be deprived for a time of his See—is singularly contrasted with the noble stand which Sancroft and his illustrious brethren made in England against the arbitrary enactments of James, and for which they were committed to the Tower.—E.]

electors, either in counties or burghs, to *turn down* Prelacy, and *set up* Presbytery. I could name more than *one* or *two*, who, if they did not *break* their *trust*, did at least very much disappoint their electors by doing so. There were no petitions—no addresses presented to the Meeting by *the people*, craving the *eversion* of Prelacy, or the *erection* of Presbytery. They never so much as once offered at *polling the people* about it. Shall I add further? After it was done, they never received *thanks* from the "generality of the people" for doing it. There was never yet any thing like an *universal rejoicing* amongst the *people* that it was done. They durst never yet adventure to require from the "generality of the people" their approbation of it. And now, if the Article was thus established at first, entirely upon the foot of *rabbling* the Episcopal clergy in the *West*, I think I might reasonably supersede all further labour about this controversy; for, not to mention that they were but the *rascally scum* of these counties where the *rabbling* was, who performed it, and that even in these counties there are great numbers of people who never reckoned Prelacy "a great and insupportable grievance and trouble," but lived, and could have *still* lived, peaceably and contentedly under it, particularly the most part of the gentry:—not to insist on these things, I say, but granting that all *the people* in these counties had been inclined, as is affirmed in the Article, yet what were *they* to the *whole* nation? Is it reasonable to judge of a *whole kingdom* by a *corner* of it? To call *these* the sentiments of all the kingdom, which were only the sentiments of *four* or *five* counties? But lest I have mistaken, in fixing on the performances of the Western rabble as the *true foot* of this part of the Article, I shall proceed further, as I promised.

The Article, however founded, thus framed and published, surprised the "generality of the people." It was thought very *odd*, not only that *Prelacy* should have been *abolished* upon such weak reasons, but that the inclinations of the "generality of the people" should have been pretended at all against it, considering how sensible *all* people were that they had never been so much as *once* asked how they stood *inclined* in the matter. It came, therefore, to be very much the subject of common discourse if it really *was so;* and many, who pretended to know the nation pretty well, were

very confident it *was not so*, and began to admire the wisdom of the Meeting of Estates, that they should have asserted a proposition so *very positively* which was so *very questionable*. In short, the noise turned so great about it that it could not be confined within the kingdom, but it passed the Borders and spread itself in England, particularly at London. This being perceived, one of the *Presbyterian agents* there, (I know not who he was) fell presently on writing a book, which he entituled—"Plain-Dealing, or, a Moderate General Review of the Scottish Prelatical Clergy's Proceedings in the latter Reigns,"[1] which was published in August, I think, or September, 1689, wherein, having said what he pleased, sense or nonsense, truth or falsehood, as he found it most expedient for coming at his conclusion, toward the end he gave his arguments for his side of our present controversy. They were these two: take them in his own words.

"1. There being thirty-two shires or counties, and two stewartries (comprehending the whole body of the nation), that send their commissioners or representatives to Parliament, and all general meetings of the Estates or Conventions; of these thirty-four districts, or divisions of the kingdom, there are seventeen entirely Presbyterians; so that, where you will find one there episcopally inclined, you will find one hundred and fifty Presbyterians; and the other seventeen divisions, where there is one episcopally inclined, there are two Presbyterians.

"2. Make but a calculation of the valued rent of *Scotland*, computing it to be less or more, or computed *argumentandi gratia* to be three millions, and you will find the Presbyterian heritors, whether of the Nobility or Gentry, to be proprietors and possessors of two millions and more, so that those that are episcopally inclined cannot have a third of that kingdom; and as for the citizens, or burgesses, and commonalty of *Scotland*, they are all generally inclined to the Presbyterian government, except Papists, and some remote, wild, and barbarous Highlanders, &c. And all this (he saith) is so true, that it can be made appear to a demonstration."

I am not at leisure to take so much *impudent trash* to *task*;

[1] [By George Ridpath.—E.]

only he himself, if he knew any thing of Scotland, could not but know that, with the same *moderation*, he might have asserted that all *Scottish men* were *monsters*, and all *Scottish women* at every *birth* produced *soutrikins!* And, indeed, as he had the *hap* to *stumble* on two such demonstrations, so I believe, to this minute, he may have the *happiness* to *claim* them as his *property;* for I have never heard that any other of *his* party (no, not G[ilbert] R[ule] himself) had the *hardiness* to use them after him. However, so far as I have learned, he was the *first author* who published any thing about this controversy.

The *Presbyterian party* having thus adventured to *exercise the press* with it, *one*,[1] who intended to undeceive the world concerning some controversies between the *Episcopalians* and the *Presbyterians* in Scotland, digested his book into Ten Questions, and made the *tenth* concerning our present subject, viz.—"Whether Scottish Presbytery was agreeable to the general inclinations of the people?"—arguing to this purpose for the *negative*:—"That the Nobility of the kingdom (a very few, not above a dozen excepted) had all sworn the Oath commonly called the *Test*,[2] wherein all *fanatical* principles and *Covenant obligations* were renounced and abjured: that not *one* of forty of the *Gentry* but had *sworn* it also; and not fifty in all Scotland, out of the *West*, did, upon the Indulgence granted by King James, anno 1687, forsake their parish churches to frequent meeting-houses: that the *generality* of the *commons* live in cities and market towns: that all who could be of the common council in such corporations, or were able to follow any ingenious trade, were obliged to take the Test, and had generally done it: that the clergy stood all for Episcopacy, there being, of about a *thousand*, scarcely *twenty trimmers* betwixt the *Bishop* and the *Presbyterian Moderator*, which *twenty*, together with all the Presbyterian preachers, could not make up the *fifth* part of such a number as the other side amounted to: that in all the Universities there were not *four Masters*, *Heads* or *Fellows*, inclined to Presbytery: that the Colleges

[1] [Bishop Sage himself.—E.]

[2] [This oath was enacted by the Parliament of 1681, and was required to be taken "by all persons in public trust in the State, Church, or Army." Skinner's Ecclesiastical History, vol. ii. p. 485, 486.—E.]

of Justice and Physic at Edinburgh were so averse from it, that the *generality* of them were ready last summer, viz. 1689, to take arms in defence of their Episcopal ministers," &c. This Book was published, I think, in the beginning of the year 1690.

What greater demonstration could any man desire of the *truth* of the *negative*, if all here alleged was *true?* And what greater argument of the *truth* of every *one* of the *allegations*, than the confession of a right uncourteous adversary—G[ilbert] R[ule] I mean, who in answer to this Book, wrote his " First Vindication of the Church of Scotland, as it is now by law established," as he calls it, published at London about the end of the year 1690, and reprinted at Edinburgh in the beginning of 1691? But did he, indeed, acknowledge the *truth* of all the *allegations?* Yes, he did it notoriously. He yielded to his adversary—" all the gang of the clergy, except a few, the Universities and the College of Justice *at least*, as lately stated." He was not so *frank* to part with the *Physicians*, indeed, because, if we may take his word for it—" there are not a few worthy men of that Faculty who are far from inclinations towards Prelacy." But he durst not say, it seems, that either the *major part*, or any thing near the *half*, was for him. He also yielded the *generality* of the *burgesses*. All the *dust* he raised was about the *Nobility* and *Gentry*, but what *nasty* dust it was let any sensible man consider. As for the Nobility, he granted there were only " a few who took not the Test." But then he had *three things* to say for them who took it—" 1. They who took the Oaths did not, by that, shew their inclination so much, as what they thought fit to comply with rather than suffer." But what were they to *suffer* if they took not the *Oaths?* The *loss* of their *vote* in Parliament, and a *small fine*, which was seldom, if at any time, exacted; but if they were to *suffer* no more, could their *fears* of such *sufferings* force them to take *Oaths* so *contrary to their inclinations?* Abstracting from the *impiety* of mocking God, and the *wretchedness* of *crossing* one's *light*, which are conspicuous in *swearing* against men's persuasions, could such *sufferings* as these *incline* any man to *swear* to support an interest which he looked on as " so great and insupportable a grievance and trouble to the nation?" But this is not all;

for he added—"2. How many of these now, when there is no force on them, shew that it was not choice but necessity that led them that way?" I know he meant that many of these *Nobles* have now broken through these *Oaths*. Let them answer for that, but what had he to do in this case with his old friend *necessity?* What *necessity* can *force* a man to do an *ill* thing? Besides, can he prove that it was *choice*, and not that same kind of *necessity*, that led them in the way they have lately followed? That men can be for this thing to-day, and the contrary to-morrow, is a great presumption that they do not much regard either; but I think it will be a little hard to draw from it, that they look upon the *one* as a "great and insupportable grievance" more than the other. But the best follows:—"3. Many, who seem to make conscience of these bonds, yet show no inclination to the thing they are bound to, except by the constraint that they brought themselves under." After this, what may not our author make an argument, that *Prelacy* is such an *ill-liked* thing, as he would have it, seeing he has got even them to *hate* it who are conscientiously for it?

Neither is he less pleasant about the *Gentry*. He acknowledges they as generally took the *Test*, which was enough for his adversary, as hath appeared. But how treats he the other topic, about their not going to the Presbyterian meetings, when they had King James' Toleration for it? Why? *A silly argument!* Why so? *Many did go;* but did his adversary *lie grossly* or calumniate, when he said, that not fifty *gentlemen* in all the kingdom (out of the *West*) forsook their parish churches, and went to conventicles? Our "*Vindicator*" durst not say he did, and has he not made it evident that it was a *silly argument?* But "*most other clave to the former way*"—(he means the Episcopal Communion)—"*because the law stood for it, and the meeting-houses seemed to be of uncertain continuance.*" But would they have *cleaved* to the *former way* if they had thought it "a great and insupportable grievance and trouble?" Would they have so *crossed* their *inclinations* as to have adhered to the communion of the Episcopal Church, when it was evident the sting was taken out of the law, and it was not to be put in execution? Were they so *fond* or so *afraid* of

a *lifeless* law, if I may so call it, that they would needs conform to it, though they had no *inclination* for such conformity—though what they conformed with, in obedience to that law, was a "great and insupportable grievance" to them? Did our author and his party reckon upon these gentlemen, then, as Presbyterians? And what though "the meetings seemed to be of uncertain continuance?" How many of the Presbyterian party said in those days, that they thought themselves bound to take the *benefit* of the *Toleration*, though it should be but of *short continuance*, and that they could return to the Church when it should be retracted? Might not all men have said and done so, if they had been as much Presbyterians? It is true, our author has some other things on this subject in that First Vindication, but I shall consider them afterwards. This was G[ilbert] R[ule]'s first *essay* in this controversy.

Another *Parity-man*, finding, belike, that neither the "*Plain-Dealer*," nor the "*Vindicator*," had gained much credit by their performances, thought it not inconvenient for the *service* of his *sect*, to publish a book, intituled—"A Further Vindication of the present Government of the Church of Scotland," and therein to produce his arguments for determining this controversy. It was printed in September, I think, in the year 1691. It is true, he wrote something like a *gentleman*, and spake discreetly of the Episcopal clergy. He had no *scolding* in his Book, and was infinitely far from G[ilbert] R[ule]'s flat *railwifery;* and I think myself obliged to thank him for his civility. But after all this, when he came to his arguments for proving the point about the "inclinations of the people," I did not think that he much helped the matter. They were these two:[1]—

1. "Though the Bishops were introduced in the year 1662, and did continue till the year 1689, during which time the far greatest part of all the ministry in *Scotland* was brought in by themselves, and though they had obtained a National Synod formed for their own interest, yet they durst never adventure to call it together, so diffident were they even of these ministers. And can there be a greater

[1] P. 32.

demonstration"—says he—" of the general inclination of this nation against Prelacy?" But who sees not how many things are wanting here to make a *probable argument*, much more *a demonstration?* For who knows not that it was not in the *power* of the *Bishops*, but of the *King*, to convocate a National Synod? And who knows not that *Presbyterian National Synods* had committed such *extravagances*, as might have tempted any King almost to have little kindness for National Synods? Again, supposing the *Bishops* might have *obtained* one, if they had been for it, but would not ask it, was there no other imaginable reason for their forbearing to ask one but their *diffidence* of the ministers? One living *twenty-four* or *twenty-eight* years agone might possibly have slipt into such a mistake; but for *one* who wrote only in the year 1691, after it was *visible*, nay, *signally remarkable* that, of near to a *thousand Presbyters*, not above *twenty* had fallen from the Episcopal principles; but all had so generally continued to *profess* them, and not only so, but to *profess* them amidst so *many discouragements*—to *profess* them and *suffer* for them:—and after this, I say, for any man to *found* a *demonstration* for proving that " Prelacy is contrary to the inclinations of the people," on the Bishop's *averseness* to a National Synod, and to *found* that *averseness* on the *diffidence* they had of the Presbyters, as if they had *dreaded*, or had *ground* to *dread*, that the Presbyters would have *subverted* their *Order* if they had got a National Synod, seems to me a very singular undertaking. Sure I am, if there is any *demonstration* here at all, it is that there was no great *store* of demonstrations to be had for our author's *main conclusion*. Neither was his other argument any stronger, which was this:—

2. "This national aversion is yet further demonstrated from this, that albeit Prelacy had all the statutes that the Bishops could desire on their behalf, and had them put in execution with the utmost severity, yet there was ever found a necessity to keep up a standing army to uphold them, and to suppress the aversion of the people; and notwithstanding thereof there were frequent insurrections and rebellions." Now, who sees not the *weakness* of this *demonstration?* For who knows not that a small part of a nation, by their notorious *ungovernableness*, and their habitual *propensities* to *rebel*, may oblige the Government to keep up a *little standing army*

such as ours in Scotland was for suppressing them, if at any time they should break out into a rebellion? The party, I think, can have but little credit from such *demonstrations*, for this *demonstration* must either suppose that *none* in the nation are apt to rebel except Presbyterians, and they, too, only upon the head of church-government; or it can conclude nothing, for if Presbyterians can rebel upon *other reasons*, though they make this the main, the specious, the clamourous pretext, as I doubt not their *democratical principles* may incline them to do upon occasion; or, if *others* than *sincere* Presbyterians can venture on the horrid sin of rebellion, there is still reason for the standing army. Besides, what *gained* they by these their frequent insurrections and rebellions? Were they not easily and readily *crushed* by the rest of the nation? But if so, I think, if there is any argument here at all, it concludes another way than our author designed it. But it is not worth the while to insist longer on this argument; only, if it is a good one, the Bishops and their adherents have reason to thank our author for shewing them the way how they may have their government restored. For by this way of reasoning they have no more to do but fall upon the *knack* of raising *frequent insurrections* and *rebellions* against the present Government, and then their work is done. For thus a *demonstration* shall *befriend* them; this, when there is a *necessity* of keeping up a *standing army* to *support* Presbytery, because of frequent insurrections and rebellions raised on its account—it is a demonstration that it is "a great and insupportable grievance and trouble to the nation, and contrary to the inclinations of the generality of the people, and therefore it ought to be abolished." The truth is, such reasonings are not only sophistical, but dangerous. They are founded upon the principles of rebellion, and they tend directly and naturally towards rebellion, and they ought to be noticed by every wise Government; and so I leave this author.

The next *paper combat* I shall take notice of was between the author of the "Third Letter"[1] in the pamphlet called—"An Account of the Present Persecution of the Church in Scotland," &c. published anno 1 90; and G[ilbert] R[ule],

[1] [Bishop Sage himself.—E.]

in his "Second Vindication," published towards the end of the year 1691.

The "*Epistler*," as G[ilbert] R[ule] is sometimes pleased to call him, had craved a *poll*, deeming it, it seems, the only proper method for coming at a sure account of the "inclinations of the generality of the people;" and I think he had reason, for if matters must go by the "inclinations of the people," it is *just* to *ask* the *people* about their *inclinations*. But would G[ilbert] R[ule] allow him this demand, which had so much of plain equity in it? No. "His talk" says he, "of putting the matter to the poll I neglect as an impracticable fancy."[1] But who sees not that this was plain *fear* to put it upon such an *issue?* What imaginable impossibility, or absurdity, or difficulty, or inconveniency, could make *polling* upon this account *impracticable?* Was it not found *practicable enough* in the days of the *Covenant*, when the *veriest child*, if he could *write* his own *name*, was put to it to *subscribe* it? What should make it more *impracticable* to *poll* the kingdom for finding the "people's inclinations" about Episcopacy and Presbytery, than it was to levy *hearth-money* from the whole kingdom? Is it not as practicable to *poll* the kingdom about church-government, as to poll it for raising the *present subsidy*, which is imposed by *poll?* I am apt to believe, the inclinations of the "generality of the people" would have been as much satisfied if *polling* had been reduced to practice on the one account, as the other.

That same "*Epistler*," in that same *Epistle*, adduced another argument which was to this purpose—"That in the years 1687 and 1688, when the schism was in its elevation, there were but some three or four Presbyterian meeting-houses erected on the *north* side of the Tay, i. e. in the greater half of the kingdom, and these, too, very little frequented or encouraged; and that on the south side of that river—(except in the *five associated shires* in the *West*)[2]—

[1] Second Vindication, ad Letter iii. Sec. 5.

[2] [Lanark, Renfrew, Ayr, Dumfries, and Kirkcudbright. It is singular that in this once fanatical part of Scotland, now included in the Diocese of Glasgow, there is a great reaction taking place in the public mind in favour of Episcopacy, which is making rapid strides in these districts, as may be seen from the number of churches, which have been erected within the last few years, and the projected ones which are soon to be commenced.

the *third* man was never engaged in the *schism*." This was matter of fact; and, if true, a solid demonstration that "Prelacy, and the superiority of any office in the Church above Presbyters, was not then a great and insupportable grievance and trouble to the nation, and contrary to the inclinations of the generality of the people." For had it been such, how is it imaginable, when there was such an *ample* Toleration—such an *absolute* and *unperplexed* liberty —nay, so much *notorious* encouragement given by the then Government to separate from the Episcopal Communion, that so *few* should have done it? Whoso pleased might then have safely, and without the least prospect of worldly hazard, joined the Presbyterians; yet scarcely a *fifth* or a *sixth* part of the nation did it. I am not sure that the nature of the thing was capable of a clearer evidence, unless it had been put to the "impracticable fancy." Let us next consider G[ilbert] R[ule's] Answers, and judge by them if the *Epistler* was wrong as to the *matter of fact*. He hath some two or three. We shall try them severally.

The *first* to the purpose is, if there be many in the northern parts who are not for Presbytery, there are as few for the present settlement of the State. To what purpose is the present *settlement* of the *State* forced in here? Was the controversy between him and his adversary concerned in it in the least? What impertinent answering is this? Is there so much as one syllable here that contradicts the *Epistler's* position?

But, 2. "We affirm," says G[ilbert] R[ule], "and can make it appear, not only that there are many in the North who appeared zealously for Presbytery, as was evident by the members of Parliament who came from these parts. Very few of them were otherwise inclined, and they made a great figure in the Parliament for settling both the State and the

It is to this portion of Scotland that the Churchman directs his eyes for encouragement, and certainly he is not disappointed, while he has most solid grounds for hoping that the present increase of the Church in those parts is but the earnest of what is likely to occur under the active superintendence of the Right Rev. Dr Russell, Bishop of Glasgow, and through the readiness with which he embraces every opportunity of getting edifices reared for the pure worship of God, the right administration of the Sacraments, and the preaching of true religion.—E.]

Church." If one were put to it to examine this Answer particularly and minutely, I think he might easily make even G[ilbert] R[ule] himself *wish* that he had never meddled with it. It were no hard task to give a just account how it only happened that there was so much as *one Northern* member (who was not such by *birth*) of the *Presbyterian persuasion* in the *Meeting* of *Estates*. It were as easy to represent what figures some of them *made*, or can readily *make*—*uncouth figures*, truly. All this were very easy, I say, if one were put to it, but as it is not seasonable, so it is not needful, for it is plain nothing here contradicts the "*Epistler's*" position, though the *Northern* members of the Presbyterian persuasion had been *twice* as many as they were, and though they had made *greater figures* than can be pretended. Yet it may be very *true*, that there were so few *separatists* in the *Northern* counties as the "*Epistler*" affirmed there were; and for the respect G[ilbert] R[ule] owes to his *Northern friends* and *figure-makers*, I would advise him never again to insist on such a tender point, and so I leave it and proceed to what follows.

3. "There are very many ministers in the North (and people that own them), who, though they served under Episcopacy, are willing to join with the Presbyterians, and whom the Presbyterians are ready to receive when occasion shall be given, and those of the best qualified among them." How such ministers as have joined, or are ready to join, with the Presbyterians, can be called the best qualified amongst the Episcopal clergy, so long as *integrity* of life, *constancy* in *adhering* to true *Catholic principles*, an hearty *abhorrence* of *schism*, *conscience* of the *religion* of *oaths*, *self-denial*, taking up the *Cross* patiently and cheerfully, and preferring *Christian honour* and *innocence* to *worldly conveniences*, can be said to be amongst the *best* qualifications of a Christian minister, I cannot understand. I understand as little what ground our author had for talking so confidently about these *Northern* ministers. Sure I am, he had no sure ground to say so; and I think the transactions of the last General Assembly, and the unsuccessfulness of Mr Meldrum's expedition to the North this summer, are demonstrations that he had no ground at all to say so. But whatever be of these things, I desire the reader to consider impartially, whether—supposing

all were uncontroverted truth our author asserts so confidently here—this Answer convells the matter of fact asserted by the author of the "Letter?" What is there here that looks like proving that the schism was greater in the North than was asserted by the "*Epistler?*" Or what is there here that can by any *colour* of consequence infer, that Prelacy in these *Northern* parts was a "great and insupportable trouble and grievance, and contrary to the inclinations of the generality of the people?" Doth not our author acknowledge that these ministers served under Episcopacy, and that their people owned them, without any *reluctancies* of *conscience?*

But the "*Epistler*" had said—"There were not above three or four Presbyterian meeting-houses on the north side of the Tay;" and the Vindicator says—"They far exceeded that number." How easy had it been for the "Vindicator" to have given us the *definite* number of Presbyterian meeting-houses in these parts during the time of the above-mentioned *Toleration?* He, who was so very exact to have his informations from all corners, might, one would think, have readily satisfied himself in this instance, and fairly fixed one *lie* on the "*Epistler;*" and is it not a great presumption that the "*Epistler*" was in the *right*, and that the "*Vindicator*," who was so anxious to have all his adversaries *liars*, was hardly put to it in this matter, when he could do no more than oppose an *indefinite* number to the "*Epistler's*" definite one? For my part, I think it not worth the while to be positive about the *precise* number; but I can say this without hesitation, that all who separated from their parish churches on that side the river would not have filled *four* ordinary meeting-houses.

From what hath been said, I think it is clear, the "*Epistler*" was honest enough in his reckoning for the *north* side of the Tay. Can all be made as safe on the south side? The "*Epistler*" had said, that (except in the West) "the third man was never engaged in the schism." G[ilbert] R[ule] answers—"We know no schism but what was made by his party; but that the plurality did not suffer under the horrid persecution raised by the Bishops, doth not prove that they were not inclined to Presbytery, but either that many Presbyterians had freedom to hear Episcopal ministers,

or that all were not resolute enough to suffer for their principle; so that this is no rational way of judging of the people's inclinations." I will neither engage at present with him in the question, who is the *Scottish schismatic*, nor digress to the point of the *horrid persecution* raised by the Bishops. Another occasion may be as proper for them; but I desire the reader again to consider this Answer, and judge if it keeps not a pretty good distance from the "Epistler's" *position?* Is any thing said here that contradicts—that looks like contradicting, the matter of *fact?* What new fashion of answering is this, to talk whatever comes in one's head, without ever offering to attack the strength of the reasoning he undertakes to discuss?

By this taste, the judicious reader may competently judge which is the right side of the present controversy; and withal, if I mistake not, he may guess if the Presbyterian *Kirk* in Scotland was not well provided when it got G[ilbert] R[ule] for its "*Vindicator*." Shall he furnish thee, O patient reader! with any more divertisement? If thou canst *promise* for thy *patience*, I can *promise* for G[ilbert R[ule].

This learned gentleman found himself so puzzled, it seems, about this part of the Article, that he was forced to put on the *fool's cap*, and turn *ridiculous* to mankind. However, it was even better to be that, than to yield in so weighty a controversy—than to part with the "inclinations of the people"—that *articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiæ*. But is there a play to succeed worthy of all this prologue? Consider, and judge. He has so limited and restricted the "generality of the people," to make his cause some way defensible, that, for any thing I know, he has confined them all within his own *doublet*; at least he may do it before he shall need to yield any more in his argument. He is at this *trade* of limiting in both his "Vindications."[1] I shall cast them together, that the world may consider the *product*.

"1. There are many ten thousands who are unconcerned about religion, both in the greater and the lesser truths of it; and it is most irrational to consider them in this question. 2. There are not a few who are of opinion, that

[1] First Vindication, ad Question 10. Second Vindication, Answer to Letter III. Sec. 4.

church-government, as to the *species* of it, is indifferent; these ought not to be brought into the reckoning. 3. There are not a few whose light and conscience do not incline them to Episcopacy, who are yet zealous for it, and against Presbytery, because under the one they are not censured for their immoralities, as under the other; these ought to be excluded also. So ought all, 4. Who had a dependence on the Court; and, 5. All who had a dependence on the Prelates. 6. All Popishly affected, and who are but Protestants in masquerade. 7. All enemies to King William, and the present Government."

I am just to him—all these exclusions out of the reckoning he has, if he has not more. And give him these, and he dares affirm that "they who are conscientiously for Prelacy are so few in *Scotland*, that not one of many hundreds or thousands is to be found"—First Vindication. "They who are for Episcopacy are not one of a thousand in Scotland"—Second Vindication. Now, not to fall on examining his *limitations* singly, because that were to be *sick* of his own *disease*—

In the *first* place, one would think, if he had been allowed his *limitations*, he might in all conscience have satisfied himself, without *begging* the *question* to boot; yet even that he has most *covetously* done. For I think the *question* was not—Who were conscientiously for Prelacy, or inclined for Episcopacy? but—"Whether Prelacy, and the superiority of any office in the Church above Presbyters, was a great and insupportable grievance and trouble to the nation, and contrary to the inclinations of the generality of the people?" And there is some *difference*, as I take it, between these questions. But let him take the *state* of the question. If he must needs have it, I can spare it to him; nay, if it can do him service, I can grant him yet more. When the matter comes to be tried by this his standard, I shall be satisfied that it fall to his share to be judge. He should understand his own *Rule* best, and so may be fittest for such nice decisions as a point so tender must needs require, though, I think, he may take the *short cut*, as we say, and give his own judgment without more ado, for thither it must recur at last, only I cannot guess why he excluded all "Popishly affected," &c. Was it to let a *friend* go with a *foe?* I think he might have

learned from history, if not from experience,[1] that Papists have been amongst the best *friends* to his interests, and very ready to do his party service upon occasion, which it is not to be thought they would have done for nothing. But however this is, having granted him so much, I think he is bound to grant me one little thing. I *ask* it of him only for *peace;* I can *force* it from him if I please. It is—that all his *limitations*, *restrictions*, *exclusions*, *castings-out*, *settings-aside*, or whatever he pleases to call them, were adduced by him for setting the Article in its *native* and *proper light*, and as it ought to be understood. But if so, I cannot think he himself can repute it *unfair dealing* to give the world a *fair view* of the Article as thus explained and enlightened; and so digested, it must run to this purpose, as I take it:—

"That Prelacy, and the superiority of any office in the Church above Presbyters, is and hath been a great and insupportable grievance and trouble to this nation, and contrary to the inclinations of the generality of the people; excluding from this *generality of the people*, 1. All these many ten thousands of the people who are unconcerned about religion, both in the greater and lesser truths of it. 2. All these many of the people who are of opinion that church-government, as to the species of it, is indifferent. 3. All these other many of the people whose light and conscience do not incline them to Episcopacy, who are yet zealous for it, and against Presbytery, because under the one they are not censured for their immoralities, as under the other. 4. All such of the people as had any dependence on the Court: 5. Or on the Prelates: 6. Or are Popishly affected, and Protestants only in masquerade. And, 7. All such as are enemies to K[ing] W[illiam] and the present civil government, ever since the Reformation (*they*, i. e. such

[1] [This was true of King James II., an avowed Roman Catholic, who, to serve his own purposes, befriended the Covenanting Presbyterians by repealing the Penal Laws. It is a well known historical fact, that, by means of his emissaries, the celebrated Cardinal Richelieu, in order to foment strife, and thus weaken the Reformed interest in Britain, held negotiations with the Covenanting party about the year 1638; and, when the Rebellion regularly broke out, arms, ammunition, and money, were supplied to these *Protestant* champions by *Romish* France. Probably this was the circumstance to which our author mainly alludes in this place.—E.]

of the people as are not excluded from the *generality of the people* by any of the aforesaid exceptions, having reformed from Popery by Presbyters), and therefore it ought to be abolished."

So the Article must run, I say, when duly *enlightened* by our author's *glosses;* and, when a *new Meeting* of Estates shall settle another *new government*, and put such an Article in another *new Claim of Right*, I do hereby give my word, I shall not be the first that shall move controversies about it. But till that is done, G[ilbert] R[ule] must allow me the use of a certain sort of liberty I have, of thinking, at least, that *his* wits were a wool-gathering (to use him as mannerly as can be done by one of his own compliments) when he spent so many of *his sweet words* (another of his phrases) so very *pleasantly*. Thus did G[ilbert] R[ule] defend this part of the Article against the arguments of his adversaries; but did he produce *none* for his own side of the controversy? Yes, *one*, and only *one*, so far as I can remember. It is in his Answer to the *First* of the "Four Letters," Sect. 7—the letter written by the *Military Chaplain*, as he was pleased to call him.

This *Military Chaplain*[1] had said—"That the Church party was predominant in this nation both for number and quality. "That it is not so," says G[ilbert] R[ule], "is evident from the constitution of our Parliament." This is the argument. Now, not to enter upon dangerous or undutiful questions about Parliaments, I shall say no more at present but this—when G[ilbert] R[ule] shall make it appear that all the Acts and *Deeds* of the present Parliament have been, all alongst, agreeable to the "inclinations of the generality of the people," or when he shall secure the *other part* of the Article against the *dint* of this his own good argument—I mean, when he shall make it appear that such reasoning is firm and solid, in the present case, and withal, shall make it appear that the *Deeds* and *Acts* of *twenty-seven Parliaments*—he knows well enough who numbered them to him—ratifying and confirming Episcopacy, cannot, or ought not, to amount to as good an argument for the "inclinations of the generality of the people" in former times. When he shall make

[1] [The Rev. Thomas Morer, Vide note, *supra* Preface.—E.]

these things appear, I say, I shall then think a little more about his argument. This, I think, is enough for *him*. At present I shall consider it no more; only, now that he hath brought the present Parliament upon the *stage*, I will take occasion to propose some few questions, which the *minding* of it suggests to me, and I seriously desire, not G[ilbert] R[ule], but some truly sensible, ingenious, and sober person of the Presbyterian persuasion—some person who had opportunity to know how matters went, and a head to comprehend them, and who has candour and conscience to relate things as they truly were, or are, to give plain, frank, direct and pertinent answers to them, speaking the sense of his heart openly and distinctly, without mincing, and without tergiversation. My question shall not in the least touch the *dignity* or *authority* of the Parliament. All I design them for is to bring *light* to the present controversy.

And I ask—1. Whether the Presbyterian party did not exert and concentre all their wit and force, all their counsel and cunning, and their art and application—all their skill and conduct in politics, both before and in the beginning of the late Revolution, for getting a *Meeting of Estates* formed for their purposes?

2. Whether the universal unhinging of all things then, and the general surprise, confusion, and irresolution of the rest of the nation occasioned thereby, did not contribute extraordinarily for furthering the Presbyterian designs and projects?

3. Whether, notwithstanding all this, when the Estates first met, they had not both great and well grounded *fears* that their *projects* might miscarry, and they might be *outvoted* in the Meeting?

4. Whether very many, very considerable, members had not deserted the House before it was thought seasonable to offer at putting the Article about church-government in the Claim of Right?

5. Whether, though they got this Article *thrust* into the Claim of Right, and made part of the original contract between *King* and *people*, in the month of April 1689, they were not, to their great grief, disappointed of the establishment of their *form* of church-government in the *first* Session of Parliament holden in *June*, &c., that same year?

6. Whether in the beginning of the *next* session (which was in *April* 1690), they were not under very dreadful apprehensions of another disappointment: and whether they would not have been very near to, if not in, a state of despair, if all the *anti-Presbyterian* members had unanimously convened, and sat in Parliament?

7. After they had recovered from these fears, and when they had the courage to propose the establishment of their Government, and it came to be voted in the House, I ask if it was any thing like a *full House?*[1] Plainly, if a *third* part of those who might have sat as members were present?

8. Whether all those members who voted for it at that time can be said to have done it from a *principle of conscience*, or a firm persuasion they had that "Prelacy was a great and insupportable grievance and trouble to the nation, and contrary to the inclinations of the generality of the people?" Or whether it may be said, without *breach of charity*, that not a few (of the *few)* voted so mainly from other principles, such as *compliance* with some *leading statesmen*, &c.?

9. Whether those of the Presbyterian persuasion, after they found that they had prevailed in the Parliament, did not proceed to make the Act, obliging all persons in public stations to sign the Declaration, called the *Assurance*, as much, if not more, for securing the government in their own hands, and keeping out *Anti-Presbyterians*, than for strengthening K[ing] W[illiam]'s interests?

10. Whether they had not in their prospect the great difficulty of getting Presbyterian ministers planted in churches, if patronages should continue, when they made the Act depriving patrons of these their rights? And whether they had not in their prospect the as great difficulties of getting such ministers planted, if (according to the true Presbyterian principles, at least *pretensions*) the calling of a minister should have depended upon the *plurality* of *voices* in the parish, when they consented to such a *model*

[1] [The Dukes of Hamilton and Queensberry, the Earls of Linlithgow and Balcarras, with many others of the Nobility and Gentry, had retired in disgust. The Bishops were in concealment; or, as Lord Dundee had wittily observed, the "*Church was invisible*," and none but those of the party remained. Skinner's Ecclesiastical History, vol. ii. p. 530. Lawson's History of the Scottish Episcopal Church from the Revolution to the Present Time, p. 107.— E.]

for *calling* of ministers as was established in that same session of Parliament?

11. Notwithstanding that Act of Parliament, which abolished patronages,[1] did notoriously encroach upon the people's power legated to them by Christ in his Testament, according to the *genuine* Presbyterian principles, by putting the *real* power of *calling* ministers in the hands of the *Presbytery*, for the greater expedition and security of getting Presbyterian ministers planted in churches—notwithstanding all this, I say, I ask, whether they did not meet with many difficulties, and much impediment and opposition in the *plantation*[2] of such ministers in very many parishes? In consequence of this, I ask—

12. Whether it was not the sense of these difficulties and oppositions, which so frequently encumbered them, that made the Presbyterian ministers so notoriously *betray* their *trust* which they pretend to have, as *conservators* of the *liberties* and *privileges* of *Christ's kingdom* and *people*, when

[1] [This Act was to the effect—"that in the vacancy of any particular church, and for supplying the same with a minister, the Protestant *heritors* and *elders* are to name and propose the person to the whole congregation, to be either approven or disapproven by them; and if they disapprove, they are to give in their reasons, to the effect the affair may be cognosced upon by the Presbytery of the bounds, at whose *judgment*, and by whose *determination*, the calling and entry of every particular minister is to be ordered and concluded, reserving to the Presbyteries the right of *jure devoluto*, and to royal burghs the calling of their ministers, as in use before the year 1600. In recompence of which right of presentation the heritors of every parish are to pay the patron six hundred merks against a certain time, and under certain proportions." It will be seen that by this Act the heritors and elders were substituted for the patron—"a number of men, more or fewer, as it might happen, and the divine right of the people, that *great idol of Presbyterian veneration, was bought and sold like any common bargain*." This Act was rescinded about twenty years afterwards, and *ever since* there has been a perpetual agitation within the Scottish Establishment for the abolition of patronage, and a return to the favourite decree of 1649, which conferred upon the Kirk what they please to call "the gospel privilege of popular elections." The result of this agitation, which has been resisted by the successive Governments of the country, has been the late *Non-Intrusion Schism*.—E.]

[2] [For instances of this, see Lawson's History of the Scottish Episcopal Church from the Revolution to the Present Time, Chap. VIII. which is devoted to setting forth, *from the admission of Presbyterian writers*, the opposition of the people in various districts to the settlement of Presbyterian ministers, and their attachment to, and determination to uphold, the Episcopal incumbents in the possession of their cures.—E.]

they consented that, in the *last* Session of Parliament, *Christ's legacy* should be so *clogged* and *limited*, as that none shall have *power* of giving *voice* in the *calling* of ministers till they shall first *swear* the Oath of Allegiance, and *sign* the Assurance.[1]

13. And lastly, I ask, whether our Presbyterian brethren would be content that all that has been done in reference to Church matters, since the beginning of the late Revolution, should be looked upon as undone; and that the settlement of the Church should again depend upon a *new*, *free*, *unclogged*, *unprelimited*, *unover-awed Meeting of Estates?*

I am very much persuaded that a plain, candid, impartial, and ingenuous resolution of these few questions might go very far in the decision of this present controversy. And yet, after all this labour spent about it, I must confess I do not reckon it was, in true value, worth thirteen sentences, as perchance may appear in part within a little. And so I proceed to

THE FIFTH INQUIRY—WHETHER, SUPPOSING THE AFFIRMATIVES IN THE PRECEDING INQUIRIES HAD BEEN TRUE, THEY WOULD HAVE BEEN OF SUFFICIENT FORCE TO INFER THE CONCLUSION ADVANCED IN THE ARTICLES, VIZ. THAT PRELACY, ETC. OUGHT TO BE ABOLISHED?

THE *Affirmatives* are these two:—"1. That Prelacy was a great and insupportable grievance, &c. 2. That this Church was reformed by Presbyters." The purpose of this Inquiry is to try if these were good reasons for the *abolition of Prelacy*. Without further address I think they were not; not the first, viz. "Prelacy being a great and insupportable grievance and trouble to this nation, and contrary to the inclinations of the generality of the people."

[1] [This, of course, would greatly curtail the number of electors among the heritors, most of whom were opposed to the new Government, were staunch Churchmen, and could not, therefore, either swear allegiance to William and Mary, or subscribe the "Assurance," which was an acknowledgment that William and Mary were as well *de jure* as *de facto*, King and Queen of Scotland, and a promise to defend their Title and Government against the late *King James*, and all *other enemies*.—E.]

1. Sure I am, our Presbyterian brethren had not this way of reasoning from our Reformers, for I remember John Knox, in his letter to the Queen-Regent of Scotland,[1] rejected it with sufficient appearances of *keenness* and *contempt*. He called it a *fetch* of the devil to *blind* people's eyes with such a sophism—to make them look on "that religion as most perfect which the multitude, by wrong custom, have embraced," *or to insinuate* "that it is impossible that that religion should be false which so long time, so many Councils, and so great a multitude of men have authorised and confirmed, &c. for," says he, "if the opinion of the multitude ought always to be preferred, then did God injury to the original world, for they were all of one mind, to-wit, conjured against God, except Noah and his family." And I have shewed already that the *body* of our Reformers, in all their *petitions* for reformation, made the Word of God, the practices of the Apostles, the Catholic sentiments and principles of the Primitive Church, &c., and not "the inclinations of the people," the *Rule* of *Reformation*.

Nay, 2. G[ilbert] R[ule] himself is not pleased with this standard. He not only tells the world that "Presbyterians wished and endeavoured that that phrase might not have been used as it was;"[2] but he *ridicules* it in his First Vindication, in answer to the Tenth Question, though he made himself ridiculous by doing it as he did it. The matter is this. The author of the Ten Questions, finding that this *topic* of "the inclinations of the people" was insisted on in the Article as an argument for abolishing Prelacy, undertook to demonstrate that though it were a good argument, it would not be found to conclude as the *formers* of the Article intended—aiming, unquestionably, at no more than that it was not true that "Prelacy was such a great and insupportable grievance," &c.; and to make good his undertaking, he formed his demonstration, as I have already accounted. Now, hear G[ilbert] R[ule]—"It is a new topic," says he, "not often used before, that such a way of religion is best, because," &c. "that his discourse will equally prove that Popery is preferable to Protestantism; for in *France*, *Italy*, *Spain*, &c.

[1] Knox, Appendix, 90.

[2] Second Vindication, in Answer to Letter III. Sec. 3.

not the multitude only, but all the Churchmen, &c., are of that way." Thus, I say, G[ilbert] R[ule] *ridiculed* the argument, though he most *ridiculously* fancied he was *ridiculing* his *adversary*, who never dreamed that it was a good argument, but could have been as ready to *ridicule* it as another. However, I must confess G[ilbert] R[ule] did indeed treat the argument justly, for—

3. Supposing the argument good, I cannot see how any Church could ever have reformed from Popery; for, I think, when Luther began in Germany, or Mr Patrick Hamilton in Scotland, or Zuinglius, or Oecolompadius, or Calvin, &c., in their respective countries and churches, they had the "inclinations of the people generally" against them. Nay, if I mistake not, our Saviour and Apostles found it so too, when they at first undertook to propagate our holy religion; and perchance, though the Christian religion is now generally professed in most nations in Europe, some of them might be soon rid of it, if this *standard* were allowed to take place.

I have heard of some who have not been well pleased with St Paul for having the word *Bishop* so frequently in his language, and I remember to have been told that *one* (not an *unlearned* one), in a conference being pressed with a testimony of Irenæus's (in his Lib. III. cap. 3. Adversus Hereticos), for an uninterrupted succession of Bishops in the Church of Rome from the Apostles' times at first, denied confidently that any such thing was to be found in Irenæus; and when the book was produced, and he was convinced by an ocular demonstration that Irenæus had the testimony which was alleged, he delivered himself to this purpose—"*I see it is there, brother, but would to God it had not been there!*" Now, had these people who were thus offended with St Paul and Irenæus, been at the writing of their books, is it probable we should have had them (with their *imprimatur*) as we have them? Indeed, for my part I shall never consent that the *Bible*, especially the *New Testament*, be reformed according to some "*people's inclinations*;" for if that should be allowed, I should be very much afraid there would be strange *cutting* and *carving*. I should be very much afraid that the "*doctrine of self-preservation*" should *justle* out the *doctrine of the Cross*—that *might* should find more *favour* than *right*, —that the *force* and *power* should possess themselves of

the places of the *faith* and *patience* of the *saints*—and that (beside many other places) we might soon see our last of (at least) the *first seven verses of the thirteenth chapter to the Romans*.[1]

I shall only add one thing more, which G[ilbert] R[ule]'s naming of *France* gave me occasion to think on. It is, that the French King and his ministers, as much as some people talk of their *abilities*, must for all that be but of the ordinary size of *mankind*. For if they had been as *wise* and thinking men as some of their neighbours, they might have easily stopped all the mouths that were opened against them some years ago for their *persecuting* the *Protestants* in that kingdom; for if they had but narrated in an *edict*, that "the religion of the Hugonots was and had still been a great and insupportable grievance and trouble to their nation, and contrary to the inclinations of the generality of the people, ever since it was professed among them," their work was done. I believe G[ilbert] R[ule] himself would not have called the *truth* of the proposition in question.

How easy were it to dwell longer on this subject? But I am afraid I have noticed it too much already. To conclude, then—What is this *standard* else than the *fundamental* principle of *Hobbism*[2]—that holy *scheme* for *brutalizing* mankind, and making religion, reason, revelation—every thing that aims at making men *manly*, to yield unto, at least, to depend on, the *frisks* of *flesh* and *blood*, or, which is all one, *arrant sense* and *ungovernable passion?* And so I leave it.

[1] [These verses relate to the doctrine of passive obedience to constituted authorities, which has at no period been the creed of Presbyterianism. Indeed, it can scarcely be said that it practically recognises obedience of any kind, when its own views are thwarted or contradicted. Its aim seems rather to be the subjugation of every opposing power to its own arbitrary sway, and the history of Scottish Covenanting Protestantism furnishes a remarkable instance of the old proverb that "extremes often meet," in the fact, that at particular periods it has asserted the claim for the complete supremacy of *ecclesiastical* over *civil* authority; thus assimilating itself by this grasping dogma to what is generally considered the worst feature in the system of "Popery."—E.]

[2] [So called from Thomas Hobbes, who was born at Malmesbury in Wiltshire, April 5, 1588, and died December 4, 1679, in his ninety-second year. He was the author of several works on politics and religion, and perhaps there has been no one whose writings have had a more pernicious influence in spreading irreligion and infidelity in the world.—E.]

But is the *second reason* any better? If this Church had been reformed by Presbyters, would that have been a good argument for abolishing Prelacy? Who sees not that it is much about the same *size* with the former? Indeed, I am apt to think, had the several Churches in the world erected their governments by this *Rule*, we should have had some pretty *odd* constitutions. Thus, the Church collected of old amongst the Indians by Frumentius and Edesius,[1] should have been governed still by *laicks;* for Frumentius and Edesius were no more than *laicks* when they first converted them. Thus all Xaverius's[2] converts and their successors should have been always governed by *Jesuits;* for it is past controversy Xaverius was a Jesuit.[3]

[1] [Two brothers who, when children, were taken by their uncle on a mercantile voyage; but on their return, the vessel in which they sailed was wrecked on the coast of Africa, and all the crew drowned except the *two* boys. They were taken to the Palace of the King of Ethiopia, who dwelt at the city of Axuma, were brought up by him, and exalted to honour. Being intent upon the conversion of the country to Christianity, in which they had been instructed before leaving Tyre, their native city, they speedily resigned their situations at the Ethiopian Court, in order that they might devote themselves to the holy work. But feeling their want of orders and mission, they sought earnestly to have it supplied. Edesius returned to Tyre, and was admitted to the priesthood. Frumentius went to Alexandria, in order to supplicate the Patriarch, the illustrious St Athanasius, to send a pastor, to complete the pious work of conversion which he had begun. St Athanasius having called a Synod of Bishops, determined to invest this zealous layman with the sacred office of a Bishop. Accordingly Frumentius was consecrated, and returned into Ethiopia, where his labours continued to be crowned with the utmost success. Having sided with Athanasius during the Arian controversy, he incurred the anger of the heretical Constantius, who endeavoured to injure him as much as he possibly could. See Butler's Lives of the Saints, vol. x. p. 546; Socrates et Sozomen, Hist. Eccles. Lib. i. cap. 19. Lib. ii. cap. 24.—E.]

[2] [The famous St Francis, born at Xavier in Navarre, in 1506, was educated at Paris, where he formed an intimacy with the celebrated Ignatius Loyola, and resolved to devote his life to missionary exertions among the heathen. In 1541 he embarked at Lisbon for the Portuguese settlement of Goa, on the Indian coast, and entered with surprizing zeal on his arduous labours in the Eastern World. After some years, during which he brought many thousands of the heathen to the knowledge of the true God, and instructed them in the principles of the Christian Faith, he turned his eyes towards the Chinese Empire, and ardently longed to carry the lamp of celestial truth into those benighted regions. In 1551 this devoted missionary proceeded towards China, but died within sight of its shores, in a deserted hut on the island of Sancian.—E.]

[3] [The well known and learned Society founded by Ignatius Loyola, and

Thus, the Churches of Iberia and Moravia should have been governed by *women* ;[1] for, if we may believe historians, the Gospel got first footing in these parts by the *ministry* of females. Indeed, if the argument has any strength at all, it seems stronger for these constitutions than for *Presbytery* in Scotland, inasmuch as it is more to *convert infidels* than only to *reform* a Church which, though corrupt, is allowed to be *Christian*—nay, which is more and worse, *more contrary to the inclinations of Scotch Presbyterians*, and *worse for Scotch Presbytery*. By this way of reasoning, Episcopacy ought still hitherto to have continued, and hereafter to continue, the government of the Church of England, because that Church was reformed by her *Bishops*. But if so, what can be said for the "Solemn League and Covenant?" How shall we defend our *forty-three men* and all the *Covenanting work of Reformation* in that glorious period? And if it must continue there, what constant perils must our *Kirk* needs be in, especially so long as *both kingdoms* are under *one monarch?*

What I have said, I think might be enough in all conscience for this Fifth Inquiry, but because it is obvious to the most overly observation that the framers of the Article have not been so much concerned for the *strength* and *solidity* of the reasons they chose for supporting their conclusion, as for their *colour* and *aptitude* to catch the vulgar, and influence the populace; and because our Presbyterian brethren have of a long time been, and still are, in use to make zealous declamations and huge noises about succession to our Reformers—because the clamour, on all occasions, that those who stand for Episcopacy have so much forsaken the *principles* and *maxims* of the Reformation—that they *pay* our Reformers so little respect and deference—that they have *secret grudges* at the *Reformation*—that they would willingly *return* to *Popery*, and what not; whereas *they themselves*

confirmed, after some difficulty, by the papal sanction of Paul III., in 1540.—E.]

[1] [Our author is wrong here with regard to the conversion of the Moravians, who, according to Mosheim, were brought to the Christian Faith about the middle of the ninth century by two Greek monks, Methodius and Cyril, whom the Empress Theodosia had sent to dispel the darkness of this idolatrous nation. The Poles and Muscovites, however, were converted through the instrumentality of women. See Mosheim, London edition, 1833, p. 193, 219.—E.]

have a *mighty veneration* for those who reformed the Church of Scotland—they are their only, true, and *genuine successors*—they are the *only men* who stand on the *foot* of the Reformation—the only *sincere* and *heart* Protestants—the only *real enemies* to *Antichrist*, &c.! For these reasons, I say, I shall beg the reader's patience till I have discoursed this point a little farther.

And to deal frankly and plainly, in the first place, I own those of the Episcopal persuasion in Scotland do not think themselves bound to *maintain* all the *principles*, or *embrace* all the *sentiments*, or *justify* all the *practices*, of our Reformers. It is true, I speak only from myself; I have no commission from other men to tell their sentiments. Yet I think the generality of my fathers and brethren will not be offended,[1] though I speak in the plural number, and take them into the reckoning; and, therefore, I think I may safely say, though *we* think *our Reformers*, considering their education, and all their disadvantages, were very considerable men, and made very considerable progress in reforming the Church, yet we do not believe they had an immediate allowance from Heaven for all they said or did. We believe they were not endued with the *gifts* of infallibility, inerrability, or impeccability. We believe, and they believed so themselves, that they had no commission—no authority, to establish new articles of faith, or make new conditions of salvation. We believe they had no power—pretended to none—for receding from the original and immovable *standard* of the Christian religion. In consequence of this, we believe, and are confident, that where they *missed* (and, being *fallible*, it was very possible for them to do it) of *conformity* to that *standard*, we are at *liberty* to think otherwise than they *thought*—to profess otherwise than they professed—we are not bound to follow them. To instance in a few of many things:—

We own we cannot allow of the principle of *popular*

[1] [Every genuine Scottish Churchman will heartily agree with what is here stated by the venerable Bishop. The Reformed Catholic Church of Scotland is in no way connected with John Knox, and those by whose influence the Church, *then* owning the Pope's supremacy, was overthrown in the sixteenth century, and her members are not concerned in defending either their opinions or practices. It is sufficient for our purpose to convince men, by undoubted facts, that John Knox, &c. were not *Parity-men*, and to drive modern Presbyterians to seek some other founders for their isolated system.—E.]

reformations, as it was asserted and practised by our Reformers. We *own*, indeed, it is not only *lawful*, but *necessary*, for *every* man to *reform* himself both as to principles and practice, when there is corruption in either, and that not only *without*, but *against* public authority, whether *civil* or *ecclesiastical*. Farther, we *own* it is not only *lawful*, but plain and *indispensible duty*, in the governors of the Church to *reform* her, acting in their own sphere even against *human* laws, in direct opposition to a *thousand Acts* of a *thousand Parliaments*—I say, *acting* and *keeping* within their own sphere, i. e. so far as their *spiritual power* can go, but no farther—*keeping* within these their own bounds, they *may* and *should* condemn heresies, purge the public worship of corruptions, continue a *succession of orthodox pastors*, &c.—in a word, *do* every thing which is needful to be *done* for *putting* and *preserving* the Church committed to their care in that state of orthodoxy, purity, and unity, which Jesus Christ, from *whom* they have their commission, and to *whom* they must be answerable, has *required* by his holy institution. But we cannot allow them to move *eccentrically*, to turn *exorbitant*, to stir *without* their own *vortex*. We cannot allow them to use any other than *spiritual means*, or to make any other than *spiritual defences*. We think they should still perform all *dutiful submission* to the civil powers—never *resist* by material arms—never *absolve* subjects from their allegiance to their civil sovereign—never *preach* the *damnable* doctrine of *deposing Kings* for heresy—never attempt to make *those* whom they should make *good* Christians *bad* subjects; but to teach them the great and fundamental doctrine of the Cross, and exemplify it to them in their practice when they are *called* to it—this we profess, and we do not think it *Popery*. But our Reformers taught a quite *different* doctrine. Their doctrine was, that it belonged to the *rabble* to *reform* religion publicly—to *reform* it by *force*—to *reform* the *State*, if *it* would not *reform* the *Church*—to *extirpate* all *false* religion by *their* authority—to *assume* to themselves a *power* to overturn the *powers* that are *ordained of God*—to *depose* them, and *set* up *new powers* in their stead—*powers* that would *protect* that which they judged to be the *best* religion. Whoso pleases may see this doctrine fully taught by Knox in his "Appellation,"[1] and

[1] P. 22, 23, 24, &c.

he may see the same principle insisted on by Mr Henderson in his debates with K[ing] C[harles] I. And who knows not that our *Reformation* was but too much *founded* on this *principle?* Herein, I say, we own we have *forsaken* our *Reformers*, and let our *Presbyterian* brethren, if they can, *convict* us in *this* of *heresy*. In short, our Reformers maintained that the doctrine of *defensive* arms was *necessary*—that passive obedience, or non-resistance, was *sinful* when people had *means* for resistance[1]—that Daniel and his fellows did not *resist* by the *sword* "because God had not given them the power and the means"[2]—that the Primitive Christians assisted their preachers even *against* the rulers and magistrates, and suppressed idolatry wheresoever God gave them *force*.[3] They maintained that the judicial laws of Moses (though not adopted into the Christian system) in many considerable instances continued still obligatory, particularly that the laws punishing adultery, murder, idolatry with *death*, were binding—that in obedience to these laws that *sentence* was to be executed not only on *subjects*, but on *sovereigns*[4]—that whosoever executes God's law on such criminals is not only *innocent*, but in his *duty*, though he have no *commission* from *man* for it—that Samuel's slaying "Agag, the fat and delicate King of Amalek," and Elias' killing "Baal's priests," and "Jezebel's false prophets," and "Phineas's *striking* Zimri and Cosbi in the very act of filthy fornication, *were* allowable patterns for private men to imitate."[5]

That all these and more such strange doctrines were common and current amongst them, I am able to prove at full length if I shall be put to it; besides, they had many other principles relating to other purposes, which I am persuaded were not founded on Scripture, had no countenance from Catholic antiquity, were not agreeable to sound and solid reason, which, we own, we are so far from maintaining, that we think ourselves bound both to profess and practice the contrary. And how easy were it to confute as well as represent some of Mr Knox's principles, which, perhaps, were peculiar to him? He fairly and plainly condemned St Paul and St James,[6] the *first Bishop of Jerusalem*, for their prac-

[1] Knox's History, 389, 396; Appellation, 25, passim. [2] Knox, 317.
[3] Ibid. 393. [4] Ibid. 391, 392, 393, passim. [5] Ibid. 356, 357.
[6] [It appears that Knox, at the outset of his preaching, was particularly

tice, Acts xxi. 18, 19, &c.[1] He esteemed every thing that was done in God's service, without the express command of his Word,[2] vain religion and idolatry.[3] He affirmed that all *Papists* were *infidels*, both in public and private.[4] I cannot think he was right in these things. He had sometimes *prayers* which do not seem to me to *savour* any thing of a Christian spirit. Thus, in his "Admonition to the Professors of the Truth in England," after he had insisted on the *persecutions* in Queen Mary's time, he had this *prayer*[5]—"God, for His great mercies' sake stir up some *Phinehas*, *Elias*, or *Jehu*, that the blood of abominable idolaters may pacify God's wrath, that it consume not the whole multitude. Amen." I must confess it was not without some horror that I put his own *Amen* to such a petition. In that same "Exhortation" he prays also thus—"Repress the pride of these blood-thirsty tyrants; consume them in Thine anger, according to the reproach which they have laid against Thy Holy Name; pour forth Thy vengeance upon them, and let our eyes behold the blood of the saints required of their hands. Delay not Thy vengeance, O Lord, but let death devour them in haste, let the earth swallow them up, and let them go down quick to the hells, for there is no hope of their amendment, the fear and reverence of Thy Holy Name is quite banished from their hearts, and, therefore, yet again, O Lord, consume them;

violent in his denunciations against those who had embraced the Reformed opinions, but still went to Mass. Maitland of Lethington defended the practice, by adducing the case of St Paul, who, by the advice of St James, Bishop of Jerusalem, went into the Temple, and purified himself with four others, who had a vow upon them, in order to conciliate the Jews; from which he fairly enough inferred, that for the sake of peace, or self-preservation, and to avoid giving offence, it is expedient and lawful to conform to established usages and ceremonies, if innocent, though not essential to religion. Knox objected to his inference on two grounds—1st, Because the case of performing vows, and attending an "idolatrous service," as he styled the Mass, were not analagous; and, 2dly, Because the practice of St Paul, and the advice of St James at that time, had no scriptural warrant, "*seeing the event proved not such as they did promise to themselves.*"—E.]

[1] Knox's History, 100; Spottiswoode, 93.

[2] [By this rule it would be difficult to *save* the worship of the third Person in the blessed Trinity, the Baptism of Infants, and the observance of the first day of the week, from this imputation. Happily the practice of the Scottish Reformers, and of ultra-protestants in general, is better than their principles!—E.]

[3] Appellation 2. [4] Knox's History, 363. [5] Knox's Appellation, 68.

consume them in thine anger."[1] Let the world judge if such prayers savour of a gospel spirit. Was this "loving our enemies, or blessing them that curse us, or praying for them who despitefully use us or persecute us?" Was this like "forgiving others their trespasses, as we would wish our own trespasses to be forgiven?" Was this like—"Father, forgive them for they know not what they do?" or—"Lord, lay not this sin to their charge?" Did Master Knox consider or know *what manner of spirit he was of* when he offered up such petitions?

I shall only give one other *specimen* of Master Knox's divinity, and because it is about a point which of late has been so much agitated, I shall not grudge to give his sentiments somewhat fully, because, perchance, he may come to have some credit by it—he may chance to be honoured as a Father by the Providentialists. The story is this:—

He wrote a book against the "Regiment of Women," as he called it. His aim was principally against Mary Queen of England. When Queen Elizabeth was raised to the throne, somebody having told her that he had written such a book, she resented it so that she would not allow him to set his foot on *English* ground, when he was returning from Geneva to Scotland, anno 1559. This grated him not a little. However, he could not endure to think upon retracting the *positions* in his book. Having once asserted them, he deemed it point of honour, it seems, to adhere to them; for thus he told Secretary Cecil, in a letter from Dieppe, April 10, 1559.[2] He "doubted no more of the truth of his proposition, than he did—that it was the voice of God which first did pronounce this penalty against women—In dolour shalt thou bear thy children." And in a conference with Mary Queen of Scotland, anno 1561, he told her, that "to that hour he thought himself alone more able to sustain the things affirmed in that book, than any ten men in Europe could be to confute them.[3] But for all this Queen Elizabeth, as I said, was raised to the throne of England, and it was needful her Majesty should not continue to have quarrels with him. Her kindness and countenance at that time to him and his projects were worth little less than a *Deanery*. Some *knack* was, therefore, to be *devised* for making a *reconcilement* between *his book* and *her regiment*.

[1] Appellation, 78. [2] Knox's History, 226. [3] Ibid. 315.

Well! what was it he fixed on? Why? The *providential right* served him to a miracle. For thus he wrote in his aforementioned letter to Cecil—"If any man think me either enemy to the person, or yet to the regiment, of her whom God hath now promoted, they are utterly deceived in me. For the MIRACULOUS work of God, comforting His afflicted by an infirm vessel, I do acknowledge; and I will obey the power of His most potent hand, raising up whom best pleaseth His Majesty to suppress such as fight against His glory, albeit that both NATURE and GOD'S MOST PERFECT ORDINANCE REPUGN to such regiment. More plainly to speak—If Queen Elizabeth shall confess that the EXTRAORDINARY DISPENSATION of God's great mercy makes that LAWFUL unto her, which both NATURE and GOD'S LAW do DENY unto all women, then shall none in England be more willing to maintain her lawful authority than I shall be; but if (GOD'S WONDROUS WORK set aside) *she* ground, as God forbid, the justness of her title upon *consuetude*, *laws*, and *ordinances* of men, then I am assured, that as such foolish presumption doth highly offend God's supreme Majesty, so I greatly fear that her ingratitude shall not long lack punishment." This was pretty fair, but it was not enough.

He thought it proper to write to that Queen herself, and give her a *dish* of that same *doctrine*. His letter is dated at Edinburgh, July 29, 1559,[1] in which, having told her he never intended by his book to assert anything that might be prejudicial to her *just regiment*, providing she were not found unfaithful to God, he bespeaks her thus—"Ingrate you will be found in the presence of His throne, if you transfer the glory of that honour in which you now stand to any other thing than the DISPENSATION of His mercy, which ONLY maketh that lawful to your Majesty which NATURE and LAW *denieth* to all *women*, to command and bear rule over men. In conscience I am compelled to say, that neither the consent of people, the process of time, nor multitude of men, can establish a law which God shall approve, but whatsoever He approveth by His eternal word, that shall be approved, and stay constantly firm. And whatsoever He condemneth shall be condemned, though all

[1] Knox's History, 231, 232.

men on earth should travel for the justification of the same. And therefore, madam, the only way to retain and keep the benefits of God, abundantly of late days poured upon you and your realm, is unfeignedly to render unto God, to His mercy and undeserved grace, the whole glory of all this your exaltation. Forget your BIRTH, and all TITLE which thereupon doth hang. It pertaineth to you to ground the JUSTICE of your authority not on that LAW which from year to year doth change, but upon the ETERNAL PROVIDENCE of Him, who, CONTRARY to the ORDINARY course of NATURE, and without your deserving, hath exalted your head. If thus in God's presence you humble yourself, I will with tongue and pen justify your authority and regiment, as the *Holy Ghost* hath justified the same in *Deborah*, that blessed mother in Israel; but if you neglect, as God forbid, these things, and shall begin to *brag* of your birth, and to build your authority and your *regiment* upon your *own law*, flatter you whoso listeth, your felicity shall be short," &c. Let contentious people put what *glosses* they please on Bishop Overall's Convocation Book,[1] sure I am, here is the *providential right*,

[1] [Overall was a learned Anglican Divine, born 1559. After occupying various stations in the Church, he was chosen, in the beginning of the reign of James I., Prolocutor of the Lower House of Convocation—was made Bishop of Litchfield and Coventry, 1614—and afterwards translated to Norwich, in which See he died, May 1619. He is chiefly famous as as having drawn up the book to which Bishop Sage alludes in this place, and of which Burnet gives the following account :—It treated of Government—" the Divine institution of which was positively asserted. It was read in Convocation, and passed by that body, in order to the publishing it, in opposition to the principles laid down in the famous book of Parsons the Jesuit, published under the name of Dollman. But King James did not like a Convocation entering into such a theory of politics," so he wrote a long letter to Abbot, Archbishop of Canterbury, in which he discouraged the printing of it, and " requested that it might not be offered to him for his assent," because, in order to justify the owning of the United Provinces to be a lawful government, " it was there laid down, that when a change of government was brought to a thorough settlement, it was then to be owned and submitted to as a work of the providence of God." Here the book slept, till Archbishop Sancroft, who had got hold of it, and not observing the objectionable passage about the Spanish rebels, resolved to publish it in the beginning of the reign of William and Mary, as the authentic Declaration of the English Church on the point of non-resistance. Accordingly, it was published in quarto, and licenced by the venerable metropolitan, a very few days before he was suspended for refusing to take the oaths to the Post-Revolution Government. See Burnet's History of his Own Times, vol. ii. 212, fol. 1734.

so plainly taught that no glosses can obscure it. Here it is maintained in plain terms, and resolutely, in opposition to all the *laws*, not only of *men*, but of *God* and *nature*.

Thus I have given a *taste* of such principles as the Prelatists in Scotland profess they *disown*, though maintained by our Reformers. It had been easy to have instanced in many more, but these may be sufficient for my purpose, which is not in the least to throw *dirt* on our Reformers (to whom I am as willing as any man to pay a *due* reverence), but to stop the mouth of impertinent clamour; and let the world have occasion to consider if it is such a scandalous thing to *think* otherwise than our Reformers *thought*, as our brethren endeavour on all occasions to persuade the populace. For these principles of our Reformers, which I have mentioned in relation to civil governments, are the principles in which we have most forsaken them. And let the world judge which *set* of principles has most of *scandal* in it. Let the world judge, I say, whether their principles or *ours* participate most of the faith, the patience, the self-denial, &c. of Christians—whether principles have least of the love of the world and most of the image of Christ in them—whether principles have greatest affinity with the principles and practices of the Apostles and their immediate successors in the *most afflicted*, and, by consequence, the *most incorrupted*, times of Christianity—whether principles have a more natural tendency towards the security of governments and the peace of societies, and seem most effectual for advancing the power of godliness, and propagating the profession and the life of Christianity. I further subjoin these two things—

1. I challenge our Presbyterian brethren to convict us of the *scandal* of receding from our Reformers in any *one* principle which they maintained in *common* with the Primitive Church, the universal Church of Christ before she was *tainted* with the *corruptions* of *Popery*. And if we have not done it, as I am confident our brethren shall never be able to prove we have, our *receding* from our Reformers, as

It is republished in the "Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology," 1844, and to the Preface of the new edition we refer the reader for much interesting matter relating to the book itself, and for the letter of King James to "good Doctor Abbot," which will well repay the trouble of perusal.—E.]

I take it, ought to be no *prejudice* against us. I think the *authority* of the Catholic Church, in the days of her undisputed purity and orthodoxy, ought in all reason to be deemed *preferable* to the *authority* of our Reformers; especially considering that they themselves professed to own the sentiments of the Primitive Church as a part, at least, of the *complex Rule* of Reformation, as I have already proved.

2. I challenge our Presbyterian brethren to instance in so much as *one* principle, in which we have *deserted* our Reformers, wherein our *deserting* them can by any reasonable—by any colourable—construction be interpreted an *approach* towards Popery. I think no man, who understands any thing of the Popish controversies, can readily allow himself the impudence to say, that to "dislike tumultuary reformations, and deposing sovereign princes," and "subverting civil governments," &c. upon the *score* of religion, is to be for *Popery;* or that the doctrine of *submission* to civil authority, the doctrine of *passive obedience*, or *non-resistance*, or—which I take to be much about one in the present case—the doctrine of the *Cross*, are *Popish* doctrines:—or that to condemn the *traitorous distinction* between the *person* and the *authority* of the civil magistrate, as it is commonly made use of by some people, and as it is condemned by the laws of both kingdoms, is to turn either *Papistical* or *Jesuitical*. Let our brethren, if they can, *purge* their own *doctrines* in these matters of all *consanguinity* with *Popery*.

3. And now after all this I would desire my readers to remember, that this *artifice* of *prejudicating* against *principles*, because *different* from, or *inconsistent* with, the *principles* of our Reformers, is none of our contrivance. Our Presbyterian brethren, not we, were the first who set on foot this *popular*, though very *pitiful*, way of arguing. By all the analogies, then, of equitable and just reasoning, they ought to endure the *trial* of their own *test*. And this brings me to inquire whether they have stuck so precisely by the principles of our Reformers, that they are in *bona fide* to insist on such a topic. And, I think, they will not be found to be so, if I can make it appear that they have notoriously deserted the principles of our Reformers—

I. In the *Faith:* II. In the *Worship:* III. In the *Discipline:* And, IV. In the *Government* of the Church.

I. I say they have forsaken our Reformers as to the *Faith* of the Church. Our Reformers digested a "Confession of Faith," anno 1560. They got it *ratified* in Parliament that same year. It was again *ratified*, anno 1567, and in many subsequent Parliaments. It continued still to be the public authorized *standard* of the *Faith* of this national Church for more than *eighty years*. Our Reformers designed it to be a *perpetual* and *unalterable standard* of the Faith of this national Church for ever. When the Barons and ministers gave in their petition to the Parliament for an establishment of the Reformation, anno 1560; they were "called upon, and commandment given unto them, to draw into plain and several heads the sum of that doctrine which they would maintain, and would desire the Parliament to establish, as *wholesome*, *true*, and *only necessary* to be believed, and to be received within the Realm;" and "they willingly accepted the command, and within four days presented the Confession," which was ratified;[1] and, that its establishment might pass with the greater solemnity and formality of law, the Earl Marischal protested that it might never be altered.[2] Yet now our Presbyterian brethren have *set up* a quite *different standard* of Faith, namely the *Westminster Confession*, and have got it now *ratified* by this current Parliament, anno 1690. It was never before *ratified* by Act of Parliament. I call it a *quite different standard of Faith*. Indeed, whosoever diligently compares both "Confessions," shall readily find it such—he shall not only find many things *kept out* of the "Westminster Confession," which *are in* the Confession of our Reformers, and many things *put in* the Westminster Confession which *were not* in the Confession of our Reformers; and many things nicely, minutely, precisely, and peremptorily determined, and that in the most mysterious matters[3] in the "Westminster Confession" which

[1] Knox, 262; Petrie, 220. [2] Knox, 279.

[3] [It is unnecessary here to compare these two Formularies, which are accessible to any one disposed to study them. But as instances of our author's assertion, it may be mentioned that every point of the Calvinistic

our Reformers thought fit (as was indeed proper) to express in very *general* and *accommodable terms*, but he shall meet with not a few plain, evident, and irreconcileable contradictions. And now by this present Parliament, in its *last Session* particularly, upon the *twelfth* day of June, anno 1693, it is statuted and ordained "that no person be admitted, or continued for hereafter, to be a minister or preacher within this Church, unless he subscribe the *Westminster Confession*, declaring it to be the *confession* of his Faith, and that he owns the doctrine *therein* contained to be the true doctrine, to which he will constantly adhere;" and by unavoidable consequence, he is bound to *subscribe* to, and *own*, God knows how many propositions, not only not required nor professed by our Reformers, but directly *contrary* to their *faith* and *principles*. And now, let the world judge if our Presbyterian brethren are the *successors* of our Reformers in point of *faith*.

II. They have forsaken them yet more in the point of *worship*, and here a vast field opens; for to this head I reduce—artificially or inartificially is no great matter, if I adduce nothing but wherein our brethren have deserted our Reformers—the public *prayers*, the public *praises*, the public *preaching* of the Word, the administration of the *Sacraments*, &c., with all their ceremonies, solemnities, and circumstances, &c.—generally, whatever uses to be comprehended in *Liturgies*.

1. In the general, our Reformers were far from condemning *Liturgies*, or *set forms*, in the public offices of the Church. There is nothing more plain than that they preferred *public* composures to these that were *private*—composures digested by the public *spirit* of the *Church*, to composures digested by the private *spirit* of particular *ministers*—and *premeditated* and *well digested* composures, though performed by *private* persons, to the too frequently *rash*, *indigested*, *incomposed* performances of the *extemporary gift*. They preferred

doctrine—the Eternal Decrees of God—His Providence—the Free Will of Man—what is called Effectual Calling—the Assurance of Faith and other abstract subjects of theology—are arbitrarily defined by the Westminster Confession, all of which were either omitted, or slightly touched, by the previous Confession. On other subjects they greatly vary, and are often directly opposed to each other.—E.]

offices which were the productions of grave, sedate, well pondered thoughts, to *offices* which were mostly the productions of *animal heat* and *warmth* of fancy.

John Knox himself (one who had as much fire in his temper, and was as much inclined to have given scope to the *extemporary spirit*, I am apt to think, as any of our Reformers) had even a *set form* of *grace*, or thanksgiving, after meat ;[1] he had a *set form* of prayer for the *public* after *sermon* ;[2] and he had *set forms* of *prayers* read every day in his *family*.[3] In conformity to this principle our Reformers, for *seven years* together, used the Liturgy of the Church of England, as I have fully proven. When—by the importunity and persuasions of John Knox principally, I am sure, if not only—they resolved to part with the English Liturgy, they continued still as far as ever from condemning *Liturgies*. They did not lay it aside to take up none. They chose another to succeed it. They chose that which went then generally under the name of the "Order of Geneva," or the "Book of Common Order," since under the name of *Knox's Liturgy*,[4] or the *Old Scottish Liturgy*. This Liturgy continued in use not only all the time the government of the Church subsisted by *Imparity* after the Reformation, but even for many *decades* of years after the Presbyterian *spirit* and *party* turned prevalent. It was so universally received and used, and in so good esteem, that when it was moved by some in the Assembly holden at Burntisland in March, anno 1601, that "there were sundry prayers in it which were not convenient for these times," and a change was desirable, the Assembly rejected the motion, and thought good that the prayers already contained in the Book should neither be altered nor deleted. But if any brother would have any other prayers added, as more proper for the times, they should first present them to be tried and allowed by the General

[1] Knox, 366. [2] Ibid. 384. [3] Spottiswoode, 266.

[4] [A new edition of this work, revised by the Rev. J. Cumming, Presbyterian minister in London, has been lately published by J. Leslie, London, and Grant and Son, Edinburgh. On the title-page are the following extracts—"*Our* Book of Common Order"—First Book of Discipline ; "Every minister shall use the Order contained therein, in prayers, marriage, and ministration of the Sacrament."—Acts of Assembly, December 26, 1564.—E.]

Assembly."[1] Here, indeed, were *caution* and *concern* about the *public worship* worthy of a General Assembly! Nay, the *first-rate* Presbyterians themselves used the *Book* as punctually as any other people. When Mr Robert Bruce[2]—of whose zeal for the *good cause* no man, I think, can doubt—was relegated to Inverness, anno 1605, he "remained there four years, teaching every Sabbath before noon, and every Wednesday, and exercised at the *reading of the prayers* every other night."[3] And Master John Scrimgeour,[4] another prime champion for the *cause*, when he appeared before the High Commission, March 1, anno 1620, and was challenged for not putting in practice the Five Articles of Perth, particularly for not ministering the *Eucharist* to the people on their *knees*, answered—"There is no warrantable form directed or approven by the Kirk, besides that which is extant in print before the Psalm Book, i. e. *the Old Liturgy*, according to which, as I have always done, so now I minister that Sacrament.[5] In short, it continued to be in use even after the beginning of the horrid revolution in the days of King Charles I., and many old people yet alive remember well to have seen it used indifferently both by Presbyterians and Prelatists. But it is not so now.

Our *modern* Presbyterians do not only *condemn* the Liturgy of the Church of England, used, as I say, by our Reformers,

[1] MS. Calderwood, 456; Petrie, 558.

[2] [This gentleman was "ordained" as one of the ministers of Edinburgh in 1598. A curious discussion arose at his "ordination," as to whether the imposition of hands was necessary to the validity of the pastoral office, or merely a useful ceremony. Mr Bruce maintained the latter, and would not accept "ordination" until his protest to that effect was received. Calderwood, 423-5. He was a very turbulent character, and, with some others of the brethren, refused to return public thanks for the King's escape from the danger of the Gowrie Conspiracy in August 1600. The others repented of their obstinacy, and were pardoned, but Bruce, with the genuine spirit of Covenanting perverseness, adhered firmly to his resolution, and was banished from the kingdom. Skinner's Ecclesiastical History, vol. ii. p. 239. He seems, however, to have returned to the former sphere of his ministry, and to have commenced anew his seditious practices. Calderwood, 496. He was arraigned at Edinburgh before the Commissioners of the General Assembly upon the "matter of Gowrie," and several other charges, and was ordered to "enter in ward at Inverness," August 1605.—E.]

[3] Calderwood, 496.

[4] [He was minister of Kinghorn in Fife.—E.]

[5] Ibid. 748.

calling it a "*dry lifeless service, a spiritless, powerless service*," an "*unwarrantable service*," an "*ill-mumbled Mass*," a "*farce of Popish dregs and relics*," a "*rag of Romish superstition and idolatry*," and God knows how many ill things; but they generally *condemn* all *Liturgies*—all *set forms of public worship* and devotion. They will admit of *none*—all to them are alike odious and intolerable. Herein, I think, there is a palpable *recession* from the *principles* of our Reformers about the public and solemn worship of the Church, and that in a most weighty and material instance. But this is not all. They have not only *deserted* our Reformers and condemned them as to *forms*, but they have made very considerable and important recessions from them as to the *matter*, both in the *substance* and *circumstances of Liturgical Offices*, and here I must descend to particulars.

1. Then, our present Presbyterians observe no forms in their *public prayers* either before or after sermon. For the most part they observe no *Rules*—they *pray* by no *standard*; nay, they do not *stick* by their own "Directory." All must be *extemporary* work,[1] and the *newer* the odder—the *more surprizing*, both as to matter and manner, the *better*. If any brother has not that *fire* in his *temper*, that *heat* in his *blood*, that *warmth* in his *animal spirits*, that *sprightliness* and *fervour* in his *fancy*, or that *readiness* of *elocution*, &c.—if he wants any *one* or *two* of these *many* graces which must concur for accomplishing one with the *ready gift*, and shall

[1] [It is quite true that at the present day this is preferred by the people in Scotland; and he is not a popular minister who does not vary his prayers, and intersperse them with flights of fancy and mysticism. Still it is confessed by many of the most respectable ministers of the Scottish Establishment that their prayers are premeditated; and those who are in the habit of attending upon their ministrations for any length of time can tell beforehand almost the entire substance of the "minister's prayer." This is specially the case at funerals. For the Presbyterians, although they have no Office for the burial of dead, go through a form of invoking a blessing upon refreshments of cake and wine, which are usually distributed to the persons invited to the funeral. In these prayers they manage to have some allusions to the afflicting circumstances which have brought them together; but such a sameness pervades these performances, that it is manifest ministers do not greatly aim at novelty, and are guided more by *memory* than extemporary impulse. This, perhaps, is as it should be, but one is tempted to ask, why not at once *honestly* have a set form? There would be less inconsistency in it, than professing to pray *extempore*, and yet almost always uttering the *identical* words in such prayers.—E.]

adventure to digest his thought, and provide himself with a PREMEDITATED FORM of his own making. He shall be concerned likewise to be so *wise* and *wary*, as to provide himself either with a variety of such *forms*, or *many disguises* for his *one* form, or he shall run the hazard of the success of his ministry, and his reputation to boot. He is a *gone man* if the *zealots* of the *gang* smell it out—that he *prayed* by *premeditation! Fore-thought prayers* are little less criminal than *fore-thought felony!* He wants the *Spirit*, and deserves to be ranked amongst the *anti-christian crew* of *formalists*. Nay, so much are they against *set forms*, that it is *Popery*, for anything I know, to say the *Lord's Prayer*. Our Reformers never met for public worship but they used it *once* or *oftener;* and they used it as in *obedience* to our Saviour's commandment. Take, for a taste, these instances, which I have collected from the Old Liturgy. The "Prayer for the whole estate of Christ's Church," appointed to be said after sermon, is concluded thus—"In whose name we make our humble petitions unto thee, even as He hath taught us, saying, *Our Father*," &c.[1] Another prayer, to be said after sermon, has the Lord's Prayer in the very *bosom* of it.[2] The prayer to be used "when God threatens His judgments," concludes thus—"Praying unto Thee with all humility and submission of minds, as we are taught and commanded to pray, saying, *Our Father*," &c.[3] The "prayer to be used in time of affliction" thus—"Our only Saviour and Mediator, in whose name we pray unto Thee as we are taught, saying, *Our Father*," &c.[4] The "prayer at the admission" of a "Superintendent," or a minister, thus —"Of whom the perpetual increase of Thy grace we crave, as by Thee, our Lord, King, and only Bishop, we are taught to pray, *Our Father*," &c.[5] The "prayer for the obstinate" (in the "Order for Excommunication") thus—"These Thy graces, O heavenly Father, and farther, as Thou knowest to be expedient for us, and for Thy Church universal, we call for, unto Thee, even as we are taught by our Lord and Master, Christ Jesus, saying, *Our Father*," &c.[6] The last "prayer before excommunication," thus—"This we ask of Thee, O

[1] Scottish Liturgy, p. 27. [2] P. 39. [3] P. 53. [4] P. 56.
[5] P. 74. [6] P. 104.

heavenly Father, in the boldness of our Head and Mediator Jesus Christ, praying, as he hath taught us, *Our Father*," &c.[1] The " confession of sins," &c., in time of " public fasts," thus—" We flee to the obedience and perfect justice of Jesus Christ, our only Mediator, praying, as He hath taught us, saying, *Our Father*," &c.[2] The prayer of " consecration in baptism," thus—" May be brought as a lively member of His body, unto the full fruition of Thy joys in the heavens, where Thy Son, our Saviour Christ, reigneth world without end; in whose name we pray, as He hath taught us, saying, *Our Father*," &c.[3]

So many of the prayers used by our Reformers were concluded with the Lord's Prayer; and it is obvious to any body that sometimes three or four of them were to be said at one assembly. And still when the Lord's Prayer is brought in, you see it is plainly in *obedience* to our Saviour's *command*,[4] from which it is clear our Reformers looked on

[1] Scottish Liturgy, p. 109. [2] P. 170. [3] P. 189.

[4] [The best proof which can be adduced in support of Bishop Sage's assertion, that the present Presbyterians have receded from the principles of the Reformers (at least) in the matter of the Lord's Prayer, is furnished by the following extract from the printed Sermons of the late Dr Andrew Thomson, Minister of St George's, Edinburgh, the authority of whose name is still of great weight in the estimation of Scottish Presbyterians. He says—" With the exception of that part of the petition respecting forgiveness, which says, 'As we forgive them that trespass against us,' the whole of it is extracted from the Liturgies that were in use among the Jews. Now, the sentiments and language of these Liturgies were of course accommodated to the dispensation under which the Jews lived. But that dispensation was different from the one under which we are placed—so different, that the former was only a preparation for the latter. It cannot, therefore, be supposed that the petitions which were suitable to the one should be altogether suitable to the other; or that Christ, acting as the Head of the Church which bears His name, and which shall continue till the end of all things, should prescribe a form of worship borrowed from a Church, all whose peculiarities were to cease whenever His own was established in the world. Had He designed this Prayer for us who live in the sunshine of the Gospel, we have every reason to believe that He would have *introduced into it petitions most directly and distinctly applicable to the characteristic doctrines of Christianity, and not limited Himself to a phraseology adapted to the darker and more imperfect state of Judaism*," &c.—" We cannot suppose that our Saviour would prescribe to us, as a set form, a prayer *so radically defective, as not to acknowledge the necessity of dependence upon His atonement and righteousness*. A prayer destitute of this explicit acknowledgement might be suitable enough to the imperfect dispensation under which the immediate disciples of our Lord were

the using of it as not only *lawful*, but *necessary*. Our present Presbyterians will not only not use it, but they *condemn* and *write against* the *using* of it. Indeed, they have not retained so much as *one* form, except that of *blessed*, used by St Paul, 2 Corinthians xiii. 14. This, indeed, they commonly say (though I am not sure they say it in the *form* of a *blessing*) before the dissolution of the assembly, but why they have kept *this* and rejected all *other forms*, or how they can reconcile the *retaining* of *this* with the *rejection* of *all other* forms, I confess I am not able to tell. Let themselves answer for that, as well as for *retaining set forms* of *praise*, while they *condemn set forms* of *prayer*.

2. Our Reformers, in their public assemblies, never omitted to make a solemn and public *confession* of their *faith*, by rehearsing that which is commonly called the "Apostles' Creed." It was said after the "Prayer for the whole estate of Christ's Church," and it was introduced thus—"Almighty and everliving God, vouchsafe, we beseech Thee, to grant us perfect continuance in Thy lively faith, augmenting the same in us daily, till we grow to the full measure of our perfection in Christ, whereof we make our confession, saying, *I believe in God the Father*," &c. Herein they are entirely deserted by our present Presbyterians also.

3. The *preaching* of the Word may be performed two ways —by the *public reading* of the Scriptures, and by *sermons*, &c. founded on the Scriptures. Our present Presbyterians in both these have receded from our Reformers.

1. As for the *reading* of the Scriptures, our Reformers delivered themselves thus in the "First Book of Discipline" Head 9[1]—"We think necessary that every church have a

placed previously to His exaltation, but *it is not all becoming the dispensation of the Gospel*, &c.; and, therefore, we cannot reasonably suppose that He would intend the Form of Prayer which He gave to His twelve disciples to be binding upon the practice of His Church in all ages." See Thomson's Lectures on Select Portions of Scripture, 12mo. Edinburgh, 1828, p. 397, 398. This quotation requires no comment beyond the remark, that the person who used this fearful language about that sacred form of devotion which our divine Redeemer uttered, was not only not called to account for it by the judicatories of the Kirk, but continues to be regarded by the members of the Scottish Establishment as a high authority on points of Christian doctrine.—E.]

[1] Spottiswoode, 170.

Bible in English, and that the people convene to hear the Scriptures read and interpreted, that by frequent reading and hearing, the gross ignorance of the people may be removed; and we judge it most expedient that the Scriptures be read in order, that is, that some one Book of the Old and New Testament be begun and followed forth to the end." For a good many years after the Reformation, there was an order of men called *Readers*, who supplied the want of ministers in many parishes. Their office was to *read* the *Scriptures* and the *Common Prayers*. The Scriptures continued to be *read* in churches for more than *eighty* years after the Reformation. In many parishes the *old Bibles* are still extant from which the Scriptures were read. Even the "Directory" itself, introduced not before the year 1645, appointed the Scriptures to be read publicly in churches, one chapter out of each Testament at least, every *Sunday* before sermon, as being part of the public worship of God, and one means sanctified by him for the edifying of his people." Yet, now, what a *scandal* would it be to have the Scriptures *read* in the Presbyterian churches? The last day's *sermons* taken from the mouth of the powerful preacher, by the inspired fingers of *godly George* or *gracious Barbara*, in some churches of no mean *note*, have been deemed more *edifying* than the Divine Oracles! The Scriptures must not be *touched* but by the *man of God* who can *interpret* them, and he must *read* no *more* than he is just then to *interpret*! What shall I say? Let Protestant divines *cant* as they please about the *perspicuity* of the Scriptures, it is a dangerous thing to have them *read* publicly without *orthodox glosses*, to keep them *close* and *true* to the principles of the *godly!* And who knows but it might be expedient to *wrap* them up again in the *unknown tongue?* But enough of this.

2. As for *sermons*, &c., the "First Book of Discipline" gives us the sentiment of our Reformers thus—"The *Sunday* in all towns must precisely be observed before and after noon; before noon the Word must be preached, Sacraments administered, &c.; after noon the Catechism must be taught, and the young children examined thereupon in audience of all the people."[1] This continued the *manner* of the Church of

[1] Spottiswoode, 168.

Scotland for full *twenty* years after the Reformation, for I find no mention of *afternoons' sermons* till the year 1580, that it was enacted (by that same General Assembly which condemned Episcopacy) that—"All pastors or ministers should diligently travel with their flocks to convene unto sermon afternoon, on *Sunday*, both they that are in landward and in burgh, as they will answer unto God."[1] The whole kingdom knows *lectures* before the *forenoon's* sermon were not introduced till the days of the "Covenant" and "Directory." Yet now a mighty stress is laid upon them, and I myself have been told, that they were *one good reason for forsaking the Episcopal communion*, where they were not used, and *going over to the Presbyterians*, where they were to be had. I am not to condemn a diligent instruction of the people; but to speak freely, I am very much persuaded the method of our Reformers, in having but *one sermon*, and *catechising* after noon, was every way as effectual for instructing the people in the substantial knowledge of our holy religion, and pressing the practice of it, as any method has been in use since. Much more might be said on this subject, but from what I have said, it is plain there is a great *dissimilitude* between our *modern Presbyterian* and our *Reformers* even in this point, and that is enough for my purpose.

4. They have as little stuck by the pattern of our Reformers in the office of *praise*. Our Reformers, beside the "Psalms of David," had and used several other hymns in metre. They had the Ten Commandments, the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, *Veni Creator*, the Humble Suit of a Sinner, the Lamentation of a Sinner, the Complaint of a Sinner, the *Magnificat*, the *Nunc Dimittis*, &c. They never used to conclude their psalms without some *Christian Doxology*. The *Gloria Patri* was most generally used. In the old Psalm Book it is turned into all the different kinds of *measures* into which the Psalms of David are put, that it might still succeed, in the conclusion, without changing the *tune*. It was so generally used, that (as Dr Burnet, in his "Second Conference,"[2] tells us), even a *Presbyterian General took it in very ill part when it began to be disused*. Yet now nothing in use with our present Presbyterians but the Psalms of

[1] MS. Petrie, 404.

[2] Edition, Glasgow, p. 182

David,[1] and these, too, for the most part, without *discrimination*. The *Gloria Patri*, recovered from *desuetude* at the last restitution of Episcopacy, and generally used in the Episcopal assemblies these *thirty years* past, was a mighty scandal to them—so great, that even such as came to church hanged their heads, and sat silent generally when it came to that part of the office.

Having mentioned Doctor Burnet's "Conferences,"[2] I will transcribe his whole period, because some other things than the *Gloria Patri* are concerned in it. "When some designers" (says he) "for popularity in the *western* parts of that *Kirk* did begin to disuse the *Lord's Prayer* in worship, and the singing the conclusion, or *Doxology*, after the *psalm*, and the *minister's kneeling* for private devotion when he entered the pulpit, the General Assembly took this in very ill part, and in the letter they wrote to the Presbyteries, complained sadly that a *spirit* of *innovation* was beginning to get into the *Kirk*, and to throw these *laudable practices* out of it; mentioning the *three* I named, which are commanded still to be practised, and such as refused obedience are appointed to be conferred with, in order to the giving of them satisfaction, and if they continued untractable, the Presbyteries were to proceed against them as they should be answerable to the next General Assembly." Thus he—and this letter he said he could produce *authentically attested*. I doubt not he found it amongst his uncle Warriston's[3] papers, who was scribe to

[1] [The version now in use, and which was sanctioned by the Westminster Assembly, is the production of an Englishman, Francis Rous, Warden of Merton College, Oxford.—E.]

[2] [These contained "A Vindication of the Church and State of Scotland," in Four Conferences, in the form of Dialogues between persons of various opinions and sentiments, and were published in 1673.—E.]

[3] [The noted Alexander Johnston, whose sister was married to Burnet of Crimond, the father of the famous Bishop of Salisbury. Johnston was educated for the legal profession, but being a person of fanatical temper, he soon became involved in the polemical disorders of his day, and was a ringleader in almost all the illegal and disgraceful proceedings which occurred between 1638 and the Restoration. He was a violent opponent to the introduction of the Liturgy, and was elected Clerk of the rebellious Assembly at Glasgow in 1638. But still, such was his influence among the deluded adherents to the Covenant, that the Government considered it necessary to propitiate him by favours. Accordingly he was "knighted by Charles I. in 1641, and appointed an Ordinary Lord of Session for life,

the *rampant* Assemblies from the year 1638 and downward. I wish the Doctor had been at pains to have published more of them. If he had employed himself that way, I am apt to think he had done his native country better service than he has done her sister kingdom by publishing "Pastoral Letters," to be used he knows how; but even from what he has given us, we may see how much the *disusing* of the *Lord's Prayer* and the Doxology is a *late innovation*, as well as a *recession* from the pattern of our Reformers.

with a liberal pension." But these honours, and the lucrative emolument which accompanied them, did not satisfy the cravings of Sir Alexander's avaricious and aspiring mind. He knew his power, and suspected that it was the weakness of the Government which prompted them to be liberal to *him*, and this only rendered him more arbitrary and determined in opposition than before. When his sovereign was in the hands of the English rebels, he would not enter into the "Engagement" formed for his rescue. He was one of the Scottish Commissioners to the Westminster Assembly, and after the battle of Philliphaugh, in which the Covenanters were victorious, he was among the fondest of the misguided zealots in demanding the lives of the defenceless prisoners, whose only crime was their having engaged in loyally defending their rightful sovereign against his enemies. In the Parliament which met at St Andrews in November 1645, he made a most sanguinary speech, and in the genuine spirit of intolerance recommended, by way of securing "unity among themselves," a severe scrutiny of the conduct of the members of Parliament, "that the several Estates might consider what *corrupted*" (i. e. loyal and Episcopal) "members were among them, who had complied with the public enemy" (i. e. the King and his adherents), "either by themselves, or their agents and friends." It is needless to say that this ferocious harangue was too successful, and was followed by the execution of the unfortunate victims, many of whom belonged to the best families in Scotland, who had fallen into the hands of the Covenanters. See Lawson's History of the Episcopal Church of Scotland from the Reformation to the Revolution, p. 647-664, where the reader will find some interesting details of the indignities and cruelties which the vanquished Royalists had to endure. During the Covenanting reign Johnston was a prime mover of every thing, and subsequently sat in Cromwell's House of Lords as Lord Warriston. After the Restoration, it was not to be expected that he would be suffered to escape the arm of the law, which he had so long violated and defied. One of the first acts of the restored Government was to issue a summons of high treason against him. He fled, as a matter of course, hoping to escape from punishment. But the legal formalities with respect to absconding criminals having been complied with, sentence of forfeiture was pronounced against him for treason, his estate confiscated, his escutcheon solemnly disgraced, and an order issued to apprehend him wherever he could be found, and to bring him to execution at the Cross of Edinburgh. For some time he evaded justice, but being at length discovered, he was brought to Edinburgh, and suffered death for high treason on the 22d July 1663.—E.]

5. And as for the decent and *laudable* custom of *kneeling for private devotion*, used by the minister when he entered the pulpit, it may be reckoned another Presbyterian late *recession*. It is certain it was used by our Reformers; it is as certain it continued in *use* till after both "Covenants" were sworn—the "National," I mean, and the "Solemn League and Covenant." It was not turned *authoritatively* (I intend no more than the *equivocal authority* which *schismatical* Assemblies pretend to) into disuse till the General Assembly, 1645. Even then it was not condemned as either *superstitious* or *indecent;* it was laid aside only in compliance with the English Presbyterians. By that Assembly a Committee was appointed, to give their opinion about "keeping a greater uniformity in this Kirk in the practice and observation of the *Directory*, in some points of public worship." And the fourth Article to which they agreed was this, word for word—"It is also the judgment of the Committee, that the ministers *bowing* in the pulpit, though a *lawful* custom in this *Kirk*, be hereafter laid aside for satisfaction of the desires of the reverend *Divines* in the *Synod* of *England*, and uniformity with that *Kirk* so much endeared to us." And then followeth the Assembly's approbation of all the Articles digested by the Committee. Here, it is evident, this Assembly owned it to be a *lawful custom*—a former Assembly called it laudable; and yet it is *scandalous*, if not *superstitious*, to our present Presbyterians. Let me add as an appendage to this—

6. Another (in my opinion) very *decent* and *commendable custom* which obtained in Scotland generally till the latter times of Presbytery. This—when people entered the church, they commonly *uncovered* their *heads*, as entering into the *house* of *God*, and generally they put up a short *prayer* to God (some *kneeling*, some *standing*, as their conveniency allowed them), deeming it very becoming to do so, when they came thus into the place of God's *special presence* and his *public worship*. This custom was so universal, that the *vestiges* of it may be even yet observed amongst old people educated before the *Donatism* of the *Covenant*, who continue to retain it. Now-a-days it is plain *superstition* to a Presbyterian, not to enter the church with his *head covered*. *Mass John*[1] him-

[1] [The origin of this sobriquet for Presbyterian ministers is not well

self doth it as *mannerly* as the coarsest *cobbler* in the parish. In he steps—*uncovers* not till in the pulpit[1]—claps straight on his *breech*—and within a little falls to work as the *Spirit moves* him! All the congregation must sit *close* in the time of *prayer*—clap on their *bonnets* in the time of *sermon*, &c. This is the way, and it brings me in mind of an *observe* an old gentleman has frequently repeated to me, which was, that he found it "impossible to perform divine worship without ceremonies, for" (said he) "the Presbyterians themselves, who pretend to be against all ceremonies, seem even to superstition, precise in observing the *ceremonies of the breech*," &c. But thus I have represented in some instances how our Presbyterian brethren have deserted our Reformers

known. Jamieson is wrong in saying that it was conferred on them as being the successors of the "Mass Priests." Why on *them* more than on Episcopal ministers? It is more likely that they obtained it from their constantly railing against the Mass, for at one time this corruption of the Catholic doctrine of the eucharistic sacrifice was the theme of all their discourses, which were full of the most unmeasured denunciations against it. Or, again, it may be that "Mas or Mess John" stands for Master or Messrs John, for it is remarkable that the Presbyterian teachers were not called *reverend* at first; and even yet in official documents we believe that title is not applied to them, they being styled simple *Mr* or *Messrs*. But however this may be, as they used to call Episcopal ministers *Curates*, they themselves have always passed by the names of "*Mass John*," or "*Mess Johns*." In writing this note upon the text, which requires explanation, we cannot sufficiently deprecate the system of applying nicknames in controversy. While error and schism exist there will be "disputings," but the advocates of true religion and Catholic order should be careful to evince to their opponents "of what spirit they are," and not return "railing for railing"—should be careful to draw a broad line of distinction between *principles*, and the *persons* of those who profess them. Even to the *former*, when they are conscientiously held, there is a delicacy due; and controversialists greatly err when they make *even the most erroneous principles* the subjects of violent vituperation and abusive language. In days when party spirit runs high there is the greatest danger, and if we have occasion to find fault with those who have gone before on this account, let us profit by their example, and endeavour to avoid their mistake.—E.]

[1] [As an instance of such irreverent behaviour, the present Editor has been informed by a person who has frequently witnessed it, that the late Sir Henry Moncrieff, Bart., minister of the West Kirk, Edinburgh, was in the constant habit of coming into that building, and walking into the pulpit, his head covered with his hat, which he hung on a peg behind him, and then, without any private devotion, commenced the service; and as soon as it was finished, he used to put on his hat again, and was generally among the first who left the church.—E.]

in the ordinary *stated* parts of *public worship*. I proceed now to the *Sacraments*.

7. Then, our Reformers had not only a *set form* for administering the Sacrament of *Baptism*, but, beside the father of the child, they allowed of *sureties* or *sponsors*. This is plain from the conclusion of the discourse concerning the nature and necessity of Baptism in the Old Liturgy; for the minister there addressed to the *father* and the *sponsors* thus —"Finally, to the intent that we may be assured that you the *father* and the *sureties* consent to the performance hereof"— of the conditions mentioned before—"declare here, before the face of this congregation, the sum of that faith wherein you believe and will instruct this child." After this there is this rubrick—"Then the father, or, in his absence, the *godfather*, shall rehearse the articles of his faith, which done, the minister expoundeth the same as followeth." That which followeth is a large explanation of the Apostles' Creed, &c. Thus it was appointed in the Old Liturgy, and thus it was *practised* universally for some *scores* of years. But our modern Presbyterians do not only abhor all *set forms*, as I have said, but to name *sponsors*, or *godfathers*, to them is to incur the scandal of *Popery*. The Apostles' Creed is no agreeable standard of the *Christian Faith*, into which *one* is *initiated* by Baptism. They cannot endure to hear of it in this *Office*. Whoso presents a child to them to be baptized, must promise to bring up the child in the faith as it is contained in the "Westminster Confession" and "the Larger and Shorter Catechisms." This they require generally. Not a few *require* that the child be educated in the *faith* of the "*Solemn League and Covenant!*"

8. About the Sacrament of the *Lord's Supper* I find many considerable alterations. Take these for a taste.

1. It was administered by our Reformers by a *set form* contained in the Old Liturgy. It continued to be so administered for more than sixty years by Presbyterians themselves, as I have observed already in the instance of Scrimgeour.

2. As for the *frequency* of this most Christian office, the "First Book of Discipline," Head 9,[1] determined thus—

[1] Spottiswoode, 169, 170.

"Four times in the year we think sufficient for administration of the Lord's Table; albeit, we deny not but every church, for reasonable causes, may change the time, and minister the same oftener." The General Assembly holden at Edinburgh, December 25, 1562, ordained the "communion to be ministered four times in the year in burghs, and twice in landward."[1] The first Rubrick in the Office for the Lord's Supper in the Old Liturgy intimates it was oftener administered, for thus it runs—"Upon the day that the Lord's Supper is ministered, which commonly is used once a month, or as often as the congregation shall think expedient," &c.

3. Our Reformers had no *preparation sermons* on the *Saturdays* immediately before the administration of the Sacrament. No vestige of any *such sermons* in the Old Liturgy, nor in the *Acts* of the *old* Assemblies, nor in any of our histories. It is plain *such sermons* were not required by the authority of any—even Presbyterian—Assembly, till the year 1645. Then, indeed, amongst the Articles prepared by the Committee mentioned before, I find this the seventh branch of the third Article, which was about the Lord's Supper—"That there be one sermon of preparation delivered in the ordinary place of public worship upon the day immediately preceding." And it is clear from the *stile* of these Articles that this was *new*, and had not been practised, at least generally, before.

4. Our Reformers thought as little on *thanksgiving sermons* on the immediately succeeding *Mondays*. Indeed, such were not required, no, not by that innovating Assembly, 1645. All it has about "thanksgiving sermons" is in the eighth branch of the aforesaid Article, which is this—"That before the serving of the Tables there be only one sermon delivered to those who are to communicate, and that in the kirk where the service is to be performed. And that in the same kirk there be *one* sermon of thanksgiving after the Communion is ended."

5. No *vestige* of *assistant ministers* at the administration of this Sacrament in the practice of our Reformers. So far as I can learn, it was that same Assembly, 1645, which first allowed this also in the sixth branch of the aforesaid

[1] MS. Petrie, 233.

Article, which is this—"That when the Communion is to be celebrated in a parish, one minister may be employed for assisting the minister of the parish, or at the most two." Indeed, as our Reformers digested the matter, there was no use for any. The minister of the parish was sufficient, alone, for all the work; for they were careful that it might be no insupportable task, as sure it ought not to be. They neither made it such as might exhaust a man's spirits, nor over burden his memory, &c. Particularly,

6. In the time of celebration they had no exhortations at all, neither *extemporary* nor *premeditated;* but the "First Book of Discipline" appointed thus—"During the action, we think it necessary that some comfortable places of Scripture be read, which may bring in mind the death of the Lord Jesus, and the benefits of the same; for seeing in that action we ought chiefly to remember the Lord's death, we judge the Scriptures, making mention of the same, most apt to stir up our dull minds then, and at all times. The ministers at their discretion may appoint the places to be read as they think good." And in the Old Liturgy the Rubrick appoints thus—"During which time"—the time the communicants are at the table, and participating of the elements—"some place of Scripture is read which doth lively set forth the death of Christ," &c. This continued the custom of the whole Church for *more* than *eighty* years after the Reformation, without any attempts to *innovate*, till the often mentioned Assembly, 1645. Then, and not till then, it was enacted—"That there should be no reading in the time of communicating, but that the minister, making a short exhortation at every table, thereafter, there should be silence during the time of the communicants receiving, except only when the minister should express some few short sentences, suitable to the present condition of the communicants in the receiving, that they might be incited and quickened in their meditations in the action."

7. Our Reformers never so much as once dreamed of keeping *congregational fasts* some day of the week before the celebration of the Sacrament; nor of shutting the doors of all the neighbouring churches that day it was to be celebrated in any parish church; nor of having so many sermons in the *churchyard* where the *office* was performed. Indeed,

no such customs entered the thoughts of the very Assembly, 1645. At least, if they thought on them, it was rather to *condemn* than *approve* them. Nothing at all, indeed, about the *preparatory fast*. But the *other two* are expressly discharged, or at least guarded against; for the ninth branch of the Committee's Article is this—"When the parishioners are so numerous that their parish kirk cannot contain them, so that there is a necessity to keep out such of the parish as cannot conveniently have place; in that case the brother who assists the minister of the parish may be ready, if need be, to give a word of exhortation, in some convenient place appointed for that purpose, to those of that parish who that day are not to communicate, which must not be begun till the sermon delivered in the kirk be concluded." And the eleventh this—"That the minister who cometh to assist have a special care to provide his own parish, lest otherwise, while he is about to minister comfort to others, his own flock be left destitute of preaching."

Thus the Eucharist was celebrated by our Reformers, and thus it was *innovated* by the Presbyterian General Assembly, anno 1645. Well! What is the method of our *present* Presbyterians? Whether do they keep by the measures of our Reformers, or their own Assembly, 1645? Or have they receded from *both?* I shall give an account of their method, as just and faithful as I can, and let the world judge.

The practice of our *present* Presbyterians is this. In many places, particularly in the West, a fast is kept on some day of the week before the Sacrament is celebrated. The congregation meets—a *lecture* and *two* long sermons are preached—*long enough*, *good enough;* but if they are not *long*, they are *good* for *nothing*. In all parishes, on Saturday afternoon another *long sermon* in the church, and in most places a *long one*, too, in the *church-yard* preached by some neighbour-brother. On Sunday (the day on which the Communion is given), *six*, *seven*, *eight*, *ten*, or *twelve* ministers, leaving their own churches empty that day, and without Divine service, convene at the church where the Sacrament is to be administered. The people of their parishes, deprived of the public worship at home, resort thither frequently also. If the minister who gives the

Sacrament is a *gracious man*—a man of renowned *zeal* for the *good cause*, most of the *first-rate* zealots, both *masculine* and *feminine*, especially the *females* of the *first magnitude*—the *ladies*, who live within six, ten, sixteen, twenty, thirty miles distance, must be there also. In the morning, pretty early, some two or three hours sooner than ordinary they fall to work. The minister of the parish himself commonly preaches a *long long* sermon in the church. After some two hours and an half, sometimes three full hours, spent in hard labour (too hard for *sides* that are not very *substantial*), he descends from the *pulpit* to the *communion table*. There he has another *long discourse* before he consecrates the elements. That done, he *consecrates* not by a *form*—that were highly *scandalous* and *unspiritual*—but as the *ready gift* serves him; after that an *exhortation*, which wants nothing but the *formality* of having a *text* read to make it a pretty long *sermon*. Then the elements are distributed to those who are set about the table, and that is called the *First Table*. These having participated, arise and remove—others plant themselves about the table—sometimes the parish minister serves this *Second Table* also; but if he does not, a *fresh brother* succeeds with another *long exhortation*, and so onward, so long as there are people who have not sat down. At *every table* (and sometimes there may be ten, twelve, fourteen tables, more or fewer as it happens) there is a *new* long *exhortation* before the *distribution* of the *elements*, and *shorter* ones in the time the communicants (who receive not from the minister, but from one another sitting, fifty, sixty, seventy, eighty, &c. about the table) are *eating and drinking*. After all the *tables* are served, the minister of the parish ascends the *pulpit*, again declaims another *long harangue*, then *prays*, &c., and all this without *papers*, from the *magazine* of his *memory*, unles it be sometimes supplied from the *stores* of the *extemporary spirit*.

But this is not all. All this time the *sermons* are *thundering* in the *church-yard*, sometimes by pairs together, if the *confluence is great*. Brother succeeds after brother, and there is sermon upon sermon—indeficient *sermoning*—till the congregation within the church is dissolved, which is not, for the most part, till much of the day is spent; indeed, cannot readily be, considering what work there is of it.

The congregation dissolved, there is a little breathing time; then the bells ring again, and the work is renewed. Some other brother than the parish minister mounts the pulpit in the church in the afternoon, and preaches a *thanksgiving sermon*, and the rest are as busy in the *church-yard* as ever; and then on Monday morning the *preaching* work is fallen to afresh, and pursued vigorously, one *preaching* in the *church*, another in the *church-yard*, as formerly. I am sure I am just in all this account. I could prove it by many instances, if it were needful, but I shall only name two. Thus, last year when this Sacrament was celebrated at St Cuthberts, where the renowned Mr David Williamson[1] exercises, on the *three* days, viz.—Saturday, Sunday, and Monday, in the church and church-yard there were no fewer than twelve or thirteen *formal sermons*, besides all the *incidental harangues*, and all the *exhortations* at the *tables*, &c. And when the Sacrament was given in the new church[2] in the Canongate in September, or the beginning of October, 1692, there was much about the same number. I myself overheard parts of some *three* or *four* which were preached in the church-yard; and that which made me have the *deeper impressions* of the unaccountableness of this their method was, that all who were in the church-yard, on Sunday at least, and *four* times as many, might that day have had room enough in the churches of Edinburgh, which were at no great distance; but it seems the solemnity of church-yard sermons[3] is now become necessary on such occasions.

[1] [This person was minister of the West Kirk of Edinburgh, and the author of four sermons preached on public occasions, one of which was severely criticized by Bishop Sage. But he is better known as the original "Daintie Davie" of the old ballad, and as one whose practice was quite inconsistent with the sacred character which he assumed. He died August 6, 1706. For a more enlarged account of him, we refer our readers to the *note*, page 349 of "Kirkton's Memoirs," edited by Charles Kirkpatrick Sharpe, Esq., and to the "Spirit of Calumny and Slander Examined," &c. 1693, in which he is accused of borrowing the greater part of one of his famous public sermons from Bishop Brownrigg.—E.]

[2] [The present parish church of the Canongate in Edinburgh, then newly erected.—E.]

[3] [The statements of Bishop Sage, respecting the "solemnity of church-yards," refer to the *tent-preachings*, as they were called, or sermons delivered from a portable wooden erection, not unlike a military sentry-box, in the church-yard, while the Sacrament was in the course of administration

I have narrated nothing in this strange account, I say, but what is *notorious matter of fact*. All this *parade* they have ordinarily even in the country; and though there are but some *scores*, or at most but some *hundreds*, to communicate, yet the communion is not *solemn enough*—there is a *cloud* upon the minister's reputation—something or other is wrong, if there are not some *thousands* of spectators.

in the neighbouring parish church. It is almost impossible to describe these annual scenes, which occurred in almost every rural parish in Scotland for upwards of a century at the "*Occasion*," as the Presbyterians call their Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and which were the resort of thousands, who often travelled many miles to be present. On the particular days, the tent was erected in the church-yard for the *edifying* of that portion of the assembled multitude who could not be accommodated in the densely crowded church. The *tent-preachings* continued from the Thursday, or whatever day was the *fast-day*—for in some parishes it is Wednesday, and in others Friday, though generally Thursday, to the following Monday, including Saturday and Sunday. While preacher succeeded preacher on all the appointed days in the parish church, and delivered extempore sermons and discourses—the excellence and value of which were only relished if the individuals could hold out for hours—the same process was carrying on at the *tent* by other preachers to the congregated mass outside. To accommodate the *pilgrims* from different parishes, booths covered with blankets or other materials were erected near the church-yard wall for the sale of refreshments, and copious libations of spirituous liquors were quaffed by those *pious* Presbyterian votaries. The preachers *relieved* each other by singing Psalms, during which the booths were filled by the thirsty auditors, who returned again to hear the next harangue. Those tent-preachings were absolute nuisances, and were the cause of much licentiousness, debauchery, and drunkenness, in Scotland. They are now abandoned, and numbered among the obsolete customs of fanaticism, having been completely discouraged by the more recent and better educated ministers of the Presbyterian Establishment; but probably none did more to bring them into justly deserved ridicule and contempt than Robert Burns, in his exquisite satire which he entitled the Holy Fair—one of his prominent poems. The *tent-preachings*, however, were long attempted to be kept up by those Presbyterian Dissenters from the Establishment known as Cameronians, or, as they call themselves, *Reformed Presbyterians*, and that class of the Seceders formerly designated by the sobriquet of *Anti-Burghers*. So fond were the peasantry of resorting to those "*Occasions*," that female servants during the eighteenth century very generally bargained with the persons who employed them, that they were to be allowed to attend a certain number of fairs and *Occasions*, or Sacraments, during the year in the surrounding parishes. A singular record of the *pilgrimages* to such celebrations is preserved in the "Memoirs of Mrs Elizabeth West," a fanatical female who lived at, and a number of years after, the Revolution, and who, though only a common domestic servant, was greatly caressed by such men as Mr David Williamson, Mr Gilbert Rule, and other *savoury* preachers, as she calls them. This little book has been often printed in Scotland.—E.]

I doubt not, when strangers read this account, they will think it a very surprising one.[1] And no wonder, for, not to

[1] [Bishop Sage's delineation of the Presbyterian administration of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper in Scotland is remarkably correct, and, though now in some degree modified, it is still the same, so far as the preaching is concerned, the only difference being that the sermons are not of such length as formerly. The following is the manner at present observed, premising to the reader that even in a small parish five "ministers" at least take part in the ceremonial. The first day of preaching is called the *Fast-Day*, when all business is suspended, the shops in the towns are closed, and the Established and Dissenting Presbyterian communities resort to their several places of worship to hear sermons. In the large cities and towns, such as Edinburgh, Glasgow, Paisley, Dundee, Perth, and Aberdeen, *two Fast-Days* are held annually, as the Sacrament is administered *twice* a-year, but in the small towns and rural parishes only *once*. The *Fast-Day* is generally a Thursday, but in those towns where the weekly market is held on that day it is either Wednesday or Friday. The reader is to observe, however, that, though called a *Fast-Day*, it is the reverse of such as it respects the *practice* of the Presbyterians themselves, who do not literally *fast*, according to the Primitive discipline, while many thousands make it a day of *pleasure* and *indulgence*. The truth is, the Presbyterian Fast Days in Scotland have long become, what the *tent-preachings* formerly were, great nuisances, and are the annual causes of much immorality and dissipation, to say nothing of the pecuniary loss they occasion to the community by the suspension of trade and labour —facts which are admitted by many Presbyterians themselves, and, indeed, are too glaring to be denied. This is farther aggravated by the circumstance that the Fast-Day is never held on the same day throughout the district, and even in the neighbouring towns and rural parishes it is always held on a different week, for the purpose, it is presumed, of procuring the assistance of the incumbents, as only "ordained ministers" can officiate, but which, it is obvious, causes the influx of the idle and disorderly from the town or parish, in which it happens to be the Fast-Day, into the towns and parishes in which it is not held. But to return to the Presbyterian celebration :—On the Fast-Day the minister of the parish commences in the forenoon by causing a Psalm to be sung. He then utters a long extempore prayer, and is succeeded by another minister, who preaches a sermon. In the afternoon a different minister preaches, and this generally concludes the religious observances of the *Fast-Day*. The next meeting is on the afternoon of Saturday, which is designated the *Day of Preparation*, when a different minister preaches, after which the "*tokens*," or small round pieces of lead or copper, about the size of a shilling, having the initial letters of the town or parish engraved, are distributed by the incumbent to all those of the congregation who intend to communicate, without which no one is allowed to participate. On the Sunday the incumbent himself commences the duties by praise, prayer, and a discourse, which is called in Scotland the *Action Sermon*, and is expected to be more profound than the usual pulpit exhibitions throughout the year. Long tables are placed in the centre of the parish church, the ordinary pews being removed for their accommodation, and the communicants seat themselves at these tables. After the *Action Sermon* is concluded, and

insist how much they have *receded*, not only from the *Rules* and *practices* of our Reformers, but even from the determinations of their own General Assembly, 1645—not only receded from them, but almost in every particular run quite *counter* to them; not to insist on what occasions may be given to much scandal and many wickednesses by such

some preliminary exhortations are delivered, the minister of the congregation descends from the pulpit, places himself at the central head of a table, and, after prayer and another address, which is called *Fencing the Tables*, he consigns the bread (which is cut in large slices half an inch thick) and the wine to the *Elders*, who stand beside him, and who, after collecting the *tokens*, hand the bread and wine to the persons sitting at each of the tables. Each person, after breaking off a small piece of the bread, hands the rest to his or her neighbour. During this process the minister continues speaking, and he then seats himself for a few minutes till all at the tables have communicated, when he rises, commences some admonitions as to what they have professed and their future conduct, and tells them to "*go in peace*." Several verses of one of the metrical Psalms authorized by the Kirk are then sung, until the seats at the tables are again filled. Different ministers succeed each other in addressing the communicants, in precisely the same form as at the first Table, and this is called *Serving the Tables*. The whole is concluded by an admonitory exhortation from the incumbent. In the evening another sermon is delivered by one of those who had served the tables, who are generally those who preached on the *Fast-Day* and *Preparation-Day*. On Monday forenoon another sermon is delivered by a different minister, though formerly it was not uncommon to have two sermons. This Monday is called in the Presbyterian phraseology the *Thanksgiving-Day*, and the whole proceedings are terminated in the afternoon by a dinner in the incumbent's house, given to his friends the assisting ministers, and to the Elders, at which the wine not used at the Sacrament is produced—that being his perquisite. In the Presbyterian Establishment the heritors or proprietors of the parish, or the Town Council in a city or burgh, are bound to provide the bread and wine, or allow a certain sum to the incumbent for *Communion Elements*. Many printed specimens of the extraordinary length of the sermons formerly preached before and after the Presbyterian Sacrament, are preserved. One, by Mr Ralph Erskine, a founder of the Presbyterian Sect known as *Seceders*, preached at Dunfermline on the 29th of September 1723, immediately *after* the "celebration," from Psalm lxxxv. 10, extends to seventy very closely printed duodecimo pages of small type, and must have occupied nearly *four hours* in the delivery. It is entitled—"The Harmony of the Divine Attributes Displayed in the Redemption and Salvation of Sinners by Jesus Christ," and was published at Edinburgh in 1724. Another, by the same Mr Ralph Erskine, from Jeremiah xxx. 21, and entitled—"The Best Bond, or Surest Engagement," published that year, is similarly printed, also contains seventy pages, and must have occupied *four hours* in its delivery. It purports to have been preached at Dunfermline, July 19, 1724, immediately *before* the "administration of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper."—E.]

indigested, disorderly, confused, and mixed convocations—(for who knows not that *hundreds*, generally *strangers* to one another, who have no sense of, no concern for, no care about, serious religion, may meet on such occasions for novelty, for curiosity, for *intrigues* not to be named, for a thousand such sinister ends?)—not to insist on these things, I say, though they are of no small consequence, what a vast difference is there between *such* communions, and the *orderly* and *devout* communions of the Primitive Church? What would the ancient *lights* and *guides* of the Christian Church, who would suffer *none* to stay in the church but such as were to *participate*, say, if they saw such *promiscuous routs* assembled, and mostly for no other end than making a *spectacle* of such a venerable mystery? Is not such unaccountable *parade* much liker to the *Popish processions* than the *devout performances* of the *purer times* of *genuine Christianity?* How impossible were it, at this rate, to celebrate the Sacrament *once* a *month* in every parish church? How much more impossible to restore it to its *due* and *proper frequency?* How far is this from looking on this holy Sacrament as an *ordinary*, though a very *signal*, part of Divine worship? Or rather is it not to make a *prodigy* of this Divine mystery? Certainly, when people observe how seldom, and, withal, with what *strange pomp*—with what ordinarily impracticable solemnity, such an holy ordinance is gone about, it cannot but work differently upon their different dispositions. It stands *fair* to be a *scare-crow* to the *weak* Christian; he dares not *approach* where there is so much *frightening address.* It stands as *fair* for being a *scandal* to the *strong* and *understanding Christian*, when he sees so much *vain show*, so much *needless ostentation*, so much *odd*, *external tricking* about it. And the *hypocrite* can hardly wish any thing more useful for him; for who should doubt of *his* being a *saint*, when he *approaches* amidst so *much* solemnity? Besides, every body may easily see what is aimed at by all this. It is, as they think, a proper method for *catching* the *populace*—it is to make them *admire* the *devotion*, the *religion*, the *abilities* of the party! How *glorious* and *august* are their *communions!* What *singular preparations* have they! How many *powerful prayers!* How many *soul-searching sermons!* Who can compare with them for *fervour*

and *zeal*, for *graces* and *gifts*, for *special marks* of God's peculiar favour and assistance? Must not their *way* be God's *way?* Must not *those* of *their* way be the *true*—the *only people* of *God?* I ask God and my Presbyterian brethren pardon, if this is not at the bottom of the matter; but if it is, I wish they would consider from what principles it proceeds. How easy is it to discern, in such *arts* and *methods*, the clear *symptoms*—the lively *signatures*—of a *schismatical* temper? How easy to perceive the plain *features* of *faction*, and the *lineaments* of a preposterous *fondness* to have their *way* and *party* had in admiration? How easy were it more fully to expose such dangerous and dreadful methods? But I am afraid I have digressed too much already.

9. There is another very considerable instance of their deserting the principles of our Reformers in the matter of this Sacrament—such an instance as may make another *strange figure* when seriously considered. Our Reformers, having once established the "Confession of Faith" as the standard for this National Church, required no more for qualifying private persons for the Sacrament of the Eucharist than that they "could say the Lord's Prayer, the Articles of the Belief, and the Sum of the Law, and understand the use and virtue of this holy Sacrament." So it is expressly delivered in the ninth Head of the "First Book of Discipline."[1] Supposing the person free from scandal, this was certainly a *genuine* measure, and agreeable to the *Rules* and *principles* of Catholic unity; for, however expedient it may be, upon some emergent *occasions* or *necessities*, to require suitable obligations of office-bearers in the Church, yet no man, I think, who loves Christian simplicity and unity, but will acknowledge it is proper and prudent to make the terms of communion as catholic and comprehensive as Christ's institutions will allow them to be made. Now, not to insist on our brethren's separating from the communion of those who *keep* by the *terms* of communion required by our Reformers, whereby they expressly *condemn* the communion of our Reformers—not to insist on this, I say, though it might be more than enough to prove their

[1] Spottiswoode, 170.

recession from the principles of our Reformers in this matter, our Presbyterian brethren are bound, by an *express Act* of the General Assembly, 1648, not to give the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper to any who do not first *swear* the *Solemn League and Covenant*. The occasion was this :—

In the beginning of that year 1648, most part of the Nobility and gentry of Scotland, having come to a sense of the miseries and calamities the kingdoms had been involved in by the horrid rebellion which had then prevailed too long and too successfully, and willing to acquit themselves for *once* as dutiful subjects, for the relief of their suffering sovereign, at that time most sadly oppressed, and kept in prison by a prevailing party of his most undutiful subjects, entered into a most *dutiful confederacy*, commonly called "*Duke Hamilton's Engagement*" — by the Presbyterians, "*the Unlawful Engagement*" — and in pursuance thereof made suitable preparations, provided arms, levied men, &c., to form an army. The Presbyterian preachers were generally against it, preached and prayed *damnation* and *ruin* to the *undertakers*, condemned the *undertaking* as unlawful and perjurious—as traiterous to the *cause* of God, and a *breach* of *Solemn League and Covenant*, and what not? Particularly the Presbytery of Edinburgh—the leading Presbytery—the Presbytery which sat upon the *watch-tower* of the nation, shewed, I must say, a *remarkable*, though I cannot say, *good* example to the *rest* of the Presbyteries in the months of *May* and *June*. They racked their inventions for falling on methods to crush and disappoint the designs of the Engagers. For instance, they set on foot this politic in the respective parishes within their district, that the ministers and kirk-sessions should form *supplications* against the Engagement, and give them in to the Presbytery, who were to give them in to the Committee of Estates, and thereby to represent to them how much their undertaking was "contrary to the inclinations of the generality of the people." The device took effect in some parishes. The kirk-sessions of Edinburgh, Holyroodhouse, Duddingstone, Liberton, Ratho, Currie, Cramond, gave in their supplications, declaring that they could not be *satisfied in their consciences* about the *lawfulness of the Engagement*. I have instanced the forwardness of the Presbytery of Edinburgh,

to give my reader a taste of the humour of these times; nor is it to be imagined that others were asleep while they were so diligent.

The General Assembly met on the *twelfth* of July. They justified the endeavours and diligence used before against the Engagement with a witness! They approved all the declarations,[1] remonstrances, representations, petitions, &c. against it, which had been made by the "Commission of the Kirk." They declared there was no possibility of securing religion, so long as this unlawful Engagement was carried on. They made *acts and declarations against Acts of Parliament*, and threatened all who should obey them with the wrath of God and the *censures* of the *Kirk*. They gave out their *public warnings* against it, and wrote to their *Covenanted brethren* in England, showing their utter abhorrence of it. They made their act declaring *silence* about it a *crime*, and requiring all ministers to make "the main current of their applications in sermons against it, under the pain of being censured by their Presbyteries." And to show their sincerity and real zeal in all this, and for preventing all such ungodly *Engagements* for the time to come, &c., they made this Act—"That hereafter all persons whatsoever should take the Covenant at their first receiving of the Lord's Supper, requiring Provincial Assemblies and Presbyteries to be careful that this Act should be observed, and account thereof taken, in the visitation of particular kirks and the trial of Presbyteries." If this was not to *straighten* Christian communion—if this was not to impose *strange terms* on all who desired this holy Sacrament, let the world judge; and it is very well known that for some years thereafter this Act was observed. Perhaps it were no difficult task to give an account of many strange things which happened in pursuance of this Act. But I shall content myself at present with one instance.

In pursuance of the *politic* of the Presbytery of Edinburgh mentioned before, the ministers of South Leith proposed to that kirk-session the overture of *supplicating* against the Engagement. The plurality of the elders rejected it. This was in *May* or *June*. The *Engagement*, as every body

[1] [See Preface, p. 94, note.—E.]

knows, was unsuccessful—the army was routed at Preston,[1] &c., and the *Kirk* had opportunity to be avenged of *Malignants*. The Presbytery of Edinburgh, therefore, on the *sixth* of *December* that same year, kept a *visitation* at the church of South Leith—they made diligent inquiry who of the elders refused to *supplicate* against the *Engagement*—they *deposed* them from their office, and they ordered the ministers to go about an election of a *new session*. But this was not all. Upon the 8th of December they met again, to digest a method for *renewing* the *Covenant*, in obedience to the Assembly's Act, and particularly they ordained that "such seducers as dissuaded others from petitioning against the Engagement should be debarred from the COVENANT." Nay, upon the 24th of January 1648, it was ordered particularly, that "those in South Leith who had accession to the paper drawn in Captain Ramsay's house"—(which paper, so far as one can conjecture, from the depositions of the witnesses about it, was nothing but an apologetick, for their not supplicating)—"as also those who were sent from the Corporations"—(the town, as I think, is divided into four Corporations)[2]—"to the ministers and session, to desire them to forbear supplicating against the Engagement, should make public acknowledgement of their offence, before they should have permission to take the Covenant." So that at last, as is obvious, the matter resulted in this—the elders of South Leith, and those who came from the Corporations to the session to *dissuade* from *supplicating*, could not have the Sacrament without first taking the *Covenant*, and they could not have the *benefit* of the *Covenant* (as it was then deemed) till they should make *public acknowledgement* of the heinous *guilt* of *not supplicating*, and, as *seducers*, dissuading others from

[1] [Preston in Lancashire, when the Scottish troops, under the Duke of Hamilton, were routed by the English army under Cromwell and Lambert with great slaughter, and the Duke himself was taken prisoner, and sent to Windsor Castle.—E.]

[2] [These Corporations, or properly *Incorporations*, built the present parish church of South Leith, which is dedicated to St Mary, and have the appointment of the second minister. The "Corporations" are understood to be, 1. The Traffickers, or Merchant Company. 2. The Trinity House. 3. The Maltmen. 4. The Convenery of the Trades.—E.]

supplicating, against the *unlawful Engagement*. For the truth of this, I appeal to the *faith* of the public register of that Presbytery.

I know our Presbyterian brethren will be ready to say that this was only a *deed* of the particular Presbytery of Edinburgh, so that, if there was any thing amiss in it, it ought not to be imputed to the whole party. If this be said, I have these things to reply:—1. What did the Presbytery herein that was not in pursuance of the *public* spirit, the times, and the Acts of the General Assembly? But, then, 2. As extravagant as the Presbytery of Edinburgh was in this matter, they came not up, it seems, to the full *measures* of *rigidity* which the *spirit* of the Assembly required. For whoso pleases to turn over in the Register[1] to the 31st of January 1648-9, shall find that the Commission of the Kirk (the *authentic vehicle* of the *public spirit* of the *Kirk* during the interval between Assemblies) wrote a letter to the Presbytery—"Requiring greater accuracy in the trial of Malignants, and admitting people to the renovation of the Covenant; prohibiting kirk-sessions to meddle in such matters, and ordering all to be done by the Presbyteries themselves, except very difficult cases, which were to be referred to the Commission of the Kirk." And to secure this side also, let him turn over to the Acts of the General Assembly, anno 1649, and he shall find first Act intituled —"Approbation of the proceedings of the Commissioners of the General Assembly," by which Act that Assembly, acted by that *same spirit* with the former, found that the Commissioners appointed, anno 1648, "had been zealous, diligent, and faithful in the discharge of the trust committed to them, and therefore did unanimously approve and ratify the whole proceedings, acts, and conclusions of the said Commission; appointing Mr John Bell, Moderator, *pro tempore*, to return them hearty thanks in the name of the Assembly for their great pains, travel, and fidelity."

If it be said, farther, that our *present Presbyterians*

[1] [The register here referred to is not extant, having been destroyed by fire, and those registers now existing do not extend further back than about the beginning of the eighteenth century.—E.]

require not now that condition of taking the *Covenant* of those they admit to the Sacrament, I reply, 1. Do not the Cameronians, who, in all *true logic*, are to be reputed the *truest* Presbyterians, observe it punctually? 2. How can our present *regnant* Presbyterians justify their *omission* of it? By their own principles, the Act binds them, for it stands as yet unrepealed by any subsequent General Assembly. By the common principles of reason, they are bound either to obey that Act, or reprobate the Assembly which made it. This I am sure of, they can neither plead the *desuetude* of that Act, nor any *peculiarity* in the reason of it for their neglecting it, more than many other Acts which they own still to be in vigour. But I am afraid my reader has too much of this. Thus I have shewed in part how much our Presbyterian brethren have deserted the *Rules* and *rites* of our Reformers about the Sacraments. Proceed we now to other *Liturgical Offices.*

10. Then, our Reformers not only appointed a *form* for the celebration of marriage (to be seen in the old Liturgy), but in that *form* some things agree word for word with the *English* form, particularly "the charge to the persons to be married, to declare if they know any impediment," &c. A *solemn blessing* was also appointed to be pronounced on the married persons, and after that, the 128th Psalm to be sung, &c. Besides, it was expressly appointed by the "First Book of Discipline" that "marriages should be only solemnized on Sunday, in the forenoon, after sermon," cap. 9;[1] and this was so universally observed, that the introduction of marrying on *other days* is remarkable, for it was proposed to the General Assembly holden at Edinburgh, July 7, anno 1579, as a "doubt whether it was lawful to marry on week days, a sufficient number being present, and joining preaching thereunto;" and the General Assembly resolved *it was lawful.*[2] But our present Presbyterians, if I mistake not, make it rather a *doubt* whether it be lawful to marry on Sunday. Sure I am, it is inconsistent with their principles to do it by a *form*, as sure I am though they were for a *form*, they could not well digest the *form* of our Reformers, which *smelled* so *rankly* of the *English corruptions.* I know

[1] Spottiswoode, 169. [2] MS. Petrie, 400.

not if they use solemnly[1] to *bless* the *married pair*. If they do not, I know they have deserted their own "Second Book of Discipline." I think they will not deny but the singing of the 128th Psalm in the church, immediately after the persons are married is out of fashion with them.

11. They have also forsaken our Reformers in the *burial of the dead*.[2] It is true, indeed, the "First Book of Discipline" seems to be against *funeral sermons*, neither doth it frankly allow of *reading* suitable portions of Scripture and singing Psalms at burials; yet it was far from condemning these offices. "We are not so precise in this" (say the compilers), "but that we are content that particular churches, with consent of the minister, do that which they shall find most

[1] [In general they do not pronounce a solemn benediction upon the married pair, but give them a *very solemn* lecture. At a Presbyterian marriage, which the present Editor witnessed, and which was solemnized by one of the most eminent of the parochial ministers of Edinburgh, there was so close an imitation of the English Service, that one might almost have imagined that the Prayer-Book had been the model according to which the minister, above referred to, endeavoured to conform his ministration. It is more likely, however, that he was guided by the old Scottish Liturgy, for with the exception of the 128th Psalm, the whole performance corresponded with the form here described.—E.]

[2] [There is no defect in the Presbyterian system which its members feel more acutely than the neglect of their Church towards those who "die in the Lord"—the cheerless and irreverent manner in which she permits the earthly tabernacles of her children, which an immortal soul has just left for a period, to be consigned to the dust. As an illustration of this feeling, the following note by Mr Cumming, appended to page 105 of his edition of Knox's Liturgy, seems peculiarly apposite:—"It is much to be regretted that the Scottish Reformers were so afraid of the superstitions of Romanism, that, in order to avoid them, they rushed, as in this instance (the burial of the dead) to an opposite extreme. What can be more scriptural or sublime than the Anglican Service for the dead!" We may add—what a pity that this service should be hidden, as it is, from the people of Scotland, by being performed in *private chambers*, thus veiling, as it were, one of our most attractive offices, which, while it would serve to keep the Presbyterians alive to their own wants, might lead them to the Church, which watches over her children from the cradle, and deserts them not until they are laid in the grave! Whenever the Burial Service is read publicly in the churchyards, the present writer, speaking from experience, can testify that it meets with the deepest respect from the multitude, and on more than one occasion, when he has performed it at the grave of a soldier, he has seen Presbyterian ministers, who have been attracted to the scene by the sound of the Dead March, standing by, and paying the utmost attention while the prayers of our Church were being offered to the "God of the spirits of all flesh."—E.]

fitting, as they will answer to God and the Assembly of the Universal Church within this Realm."[1] But the Old Liturgy, which was authorized by *two General Assemblies* (which the "First Book of Discipline" could never pretend to), has not only a *form for visiting the sick*, (not observed, I am sure by our present Presbyterians) but expressly allows of funeral sermons. These are its very words about *burial:*—"The corpse shall be reverently brought to the grave, accompanied with the congregation without any further ceremonies, which being buried, the minister, if he be present and required, goeth to the church, if it be not too far off, and maketh some comfortable exhortation to the people touching death and the resurrection; then blesseth the people, and dismisseth them." To our present Presbyterians *funeral sermons* are as the *worshipping* of *relics*. They are every whit as ill as *praying for the dead* and the doctrine of Purgatory. One thing more I shall take notice of in the Old Liturgy.

12. It is the "Form and Order of the election of the Superintendent, which may serve in election of all other ministers." I shall not repeat what I have already observed as to this point, concerning our Presbyterians condemning the office of Superintendents, and their forsaking our Reformers as to the ceremony of *imposition* of hands in ordinations —a point wherein our Reformers, I confess, were somewhat unaccountable. That which I take notice of now is, that that *form* continued at least for *sixty* years to be used in ordinations. Particularly it was in use even with the *Parity men* anno 1618, as is evident from Calderwood,[2] and it was insisted on by them then, as a form which was to be reputed so venerable, and of such weight, that any *recession* from it was an *intolerable innovation;* and yet I refer it to our present Presbyterians themselves, if they can say that they have not entirely deserted it. Because the designation of the person to be ordained is *prior*, in order of nature, to his ordination, I shall add, as an appendage to this head, the *discrepance* between our Reformers and our present Presbyterians about *patronages* and *popular elections* of ministers.

Our present Presbyterians, every body knows, are zealous for the *divine right* of *popular elections*. The *power* of choosing

[1] Spottiswoode, 173. [2] Calderwoode, 712.

their own ministers—"the persons who are to have the charge of their souls," is a *privilege* which Christ by his Testament hath bequeathed to his people. It is his *legacy* to them—an *unalienable* part of their *spiritual property*. It cannot be taken from them without a *direct crossing of Christ's institution*, and the horrid *sin* of *robbing* his people of their *indisputable* privilege. Patronages are an "intolerable grievance and yoke of bondage on the Church; they have been always the cause of pestering the Church with a bad ministry; they came in amongst the latest antichristian corruptions and usurpations," &c. This is their doctrine, though it is obvious to all the world they put strange comments on it by their practice. Well! What were the sentiments of our Reformers in this matter? The "First Book of Discipline," indeed, affirms (Head 4,) that "it appertaineth to the people, and to every several congregation, to elect their own minister;" but it has not so much as one syllable of the *divine institution* of such a privilege. On the contrary, in that same very breath it adds—"And in case they be found negligent therein the space of forty days, the Superintendent with his Council may present a man," &c. If this man after trial, is found qualified, and the church can justly reprehend nothing in his life, doctrine, or utterance, then "we judge" (say our Reformers) "the church which before was destitute unreasonable if they refuse him whom the Church doth offer, and that they should be compelled, by the censure of the Council and Church, to receive the person appointed and approved by the judgment of the godly and learned, unless that the same church hath presented a man better, or as well qualified, to examination, before that the aforesaid trial was taken of the person presented by the Council of the whole Church; as, for example, the Council of the Church presents a man unto a church to be their minister, not knowing that they are otherwise provided: In the mean time, the church hath another sufficient in their judgment for that charge, whom they present to the learned ministers, and next Reformed church to be examined: In this case, the presentation of the people to whom he should be appointed pastor must be preferred to the presentation of the Council or greater Church, unless the person presented by the inferior church be judged unable for the regiment by

the learned. For this is always to be avoided, that no man be intruded or thrust in upon any congregation; but this liberty, with all care, must be reserved for every several church to have their voices and suffrages in election of their ministers; yet we do not call that violent intrusion, when the Council of the Church, in the fear of God, regarding only the salvation of the people, offereth unto them a man sufficient to instruct them, whom they shall not be forced to admit before just examination." So that Book. Add, to this this consideration, that at that time the *Popish clergy* were in possession of all the benefices—the Reformed clergy had not then so much as the prospect of the Thirds, which I have discoursed of before. These things laid together, it is obvious to perceive, 1. That it was only from *prudential considerations* our Reformers were inclined to give the people so much *power* at that time—it was much for the *conveniency* of the ministers who were to live by the *benevolence* of the parish, &c. They did not grant them this *power* as of *divine right*—no such thing so much as once insinuated as I have said—it was plainly nothing but a *liberty*. And no injury, no *violence*, was done to a parish even in these circumstances of the Church, when the Council of the Church gave them a minister without their own election. It is plain 2. That (so far as can be collected from the whole period above) our Reformers (the compilers of the Book, I mean), abstracting from the then circumstances of the Church were more inclined that the election of ministers should be in the hands of the *clergy* than of the *people*, which I am much inclined to think was not only then, but a long time after, the prevailing sentiment. And all the world sees, I am sure, it was a sentiment utterly inconsistent with the opinion of the *divine right* of *popular elections*.

I have been at pains to set the "First Book of Discipline" thus in its due light, that our brethren may not complain it was neglected; not that my cause required it, for that Book was never *law*, either *civil* or *ecclesiastical*, and so I might fairly have omitted it. Let us try, next, what were truly the *public* and *authoritative sentiments* of our Reformers.

The first which I find of that nature is the sentiment of the General Assembly, holden in September 1565. The General Assembly holden in June immediately before had

complained, that "some vacant benefices had been bestowed by the Queen on some Noblemen and Barons."[1] The Queen answered—"She thought it not reasonable to deprive her of the patronages belonging to her." And this General Assembly, in September, answer thus—"Our mind is not that her Majesty or any other person should be defrauded of their just patronages, but we mean, whensoever her Majesty, or any other patron, do present any person unto a benefice, that the person presented should be tried and examined by the judgment of learned men of the Church, such as are for the present the Superintendents; and as the presentation of the benefice belongs to the patron, so the collation, by law and reason, belongeth to the Church."[2] Agreeably, we find by the 7th Act, 1 Parl. Jac. VI., anno 1567—the Parliament holden by Moray, Regent—it was enacted, in pursuance, no doubt, of the *agreement* between the Nobility and Barons, and the Clergy in the General Assembly holden in July that year—"That the patron should present a qualified person within six months to the Superintendent of these parts where the benefice lies." &c.; and by the Agreement at Leith, anno 1572, the right of patronages was reserved to the *respective patrons*.[3] And by the General Assembly holden in March 1574, it was enacted—"that collations upon presentations to benefices should not be given without consent of three qualified ministers," &c.[4] The General Assembly, in August that same year, supplicated the Regent "that Bishops might be presented to vacant Bishopricks," as I have observed before. By the General Assembly holden in October 1578, it was enacted—"That presentations to benefices be directed to the Commissioners of the countries where the benefice lies."[5]

It is true, indeed, the "Second Book of Discipline," cap. 12, § 10, condemns "Patronages, as having no ground in the Word of God, as contrary to the same, and as contrary to the liberty of the election of pastors, and that which ought not to have place in the light of Reformation."[6] But, then, it is as true, 1. That that same General Assembly, holden in April 1581, which first ratified this "Second

[1] MS. Petrie, 342. [2] MS. Petrie, 344; Spottiswoode, 193.
[3] Calderwood, 52. [4] Ibid. 66. [5] MS. Petrie, 396; Calderwood, 84.
[6] MS. Spottiswoode, 301; Calderwood, 114.

Book of Discipline," statuted and ordained—"That laick patronages should remain whole, unjointed and undivided, unless with consent of the patron."[1] So that let them, who can, reconcile the Acts of this Presbyterian Assembly; for to my skill (which, I confess, is not very great) it seems, as we use to say, to have both *burnt* and *blown* patronages—*blown* them by this Act, and *burnt* them by ratifying the Book which *condemned* them. But whatever is of this, that which I observe, 2. is far more considerable; for, though the Book condemned *patronages*, yet our Presbyterian brethren of the *modern cut* have no great advantage by it, for it had nothing less in its prospect than to condemn them for making way for *popular elections*. Indeed, it gave no countenance to such elections, far less did it suppose or assert them to be of *divine right*. This is its determination in the 9th section of that 12th chapter.—"The liberty of electing persons to ecclesiastical functions, observed without interruptions so long as the Church was not corrupted by Antichrist, we desire to be restored and retained within this realm; so as none be intruded upon any congregation, either by the Prince, or any other inferior person, WITHOUT LAWFUL ELECTION, and THE ASSENT OF THE PEOPLE, over whom the person is placed, according to the practice of the Apostolic and Primitive Church." Now, 1. Considering that it was the common talk of the Presbyterians of these times, that *antichristian corruptions* began to *pester* the Church so soon as Episcopacy was introduced, it is clear that that which they call the *uninterrupted practice of the Church* must have descended, according to themselves, but for a very *few years;* and I shall own myself their humble servant, if our present Presbyterians shall prove that *popular elections* were in *universal uninterrupted practice* during that interval of their own making—the interval, I mean, which they make between the Apostles' times and the first introduction of Episcopacy. Indeed, 2. The Book plainly *distinguishes* between LAWFUL ELECTION and the ASSENT OF THE PEOPLE, and all the world knows they are naturally *distinguishable;* and whosoever knows any thing of the monuments of these

[1] MS. Petrie, 410; Calderwood, 99.

Primitive times, knows they were *actually distinguished*, and that all the people's privilege was to ASSENT, not to ELECT. They were not in use of *electing*, if I mistake not, till towards the end of the third century; so that, if we can believe the compilers of the Book, if they were for restoring the *Primitive practice*, it is easy to understand that they meant no such thing as to restore *popular elections*. Especially, if, 3. It be considered that we have one very authentic explication of this ninth Article of the 12th chapter of the "Second Book of Discipline" handed down to us by Calderwood himself.[1] The story is this.

King James VI., continually vext with the turbulency of the Presbyterian temper, caused publish fifty-five Questions, and proposed them to be sifted, thinking that clear and distinct resolutions of them might contribute much for ending many controversies agitated in those times between the Kirk and the Crown. They were published in February or January 1596-7—they are to be seen both in Spottiswoode's and Calderwood's Histories.[2] I am only concerned at present for the third Question, which was this—"Is not the consent of the most part of the flock, and also of the patrons, necessary in the election of pastors?" Now, Calderwood says that "there were brethren delegated from every Presbytery of Fife, who met at *St Andrews* upon the 21st of February, and having tossed the King's Questions sundry days," gave answers to every one of them, particularly to the third. This was their answer—"The election of pastors should be made by those who are pastors and doctors lawfully called, and who can try the gifts necessarily belonging to pastors by the Word of God; and to such as are so chosen, the flock and patron should give their consent and protection."[3] Now this, I say, is a very *authentic* explication of the words of the Book; for these delegates meeting at St Andrews, it is not to be doubted but Mr Andrew Melville, at that time Principal of the New College, was with them. Probably they met in that city that he might be with them, for sure I am it was not otherwise the most convenient place of the county for their meeting; and having him with them,

[1] Calderwood, 383. [2] Spottiswoode, 434; Calderwood, 382.
[3] Calderwood, 383.

they had *one*, than whom *none* on earth[1] was capable of giving a more *authentic sense* of the words of the Book.

It were very easy to adduce more Acts of General Assemblies to this purpose, but I am afraid I have insisted too much on this subject already. In short, then, the *groundless fancy* of the Divine right of popular elections is more properly an *Independent* than a *Presbyterian* principle. The English Presbyterians of the Provincial Assembly of London wrote zealously against it in their "Jus Divinum Ministerii Evangelici." It is truly inconsistent with the *old* Presbyterian scheme—it obtained not generally amongst our *Scottish* Presbyterians till some years after 1638—it was not adopted into their *scheme* till the General Assembly, 1649. Patronages were never taken away by Act of Parliament till of late, i. e. in the year 1690. It is true, G[ilbert] R[ule], in his "True Representation of Presbyterian Government,"[2] says, "*they were taken away by law*," meaning, no doubt, by the Act of the pretended Parliament,[3] anno 1649. But he had just as much reason for calling that *Rout* a *Parliament*, or its *Acts*, *Laws*, as he had for making the suppressing of *popular elections* of ministers a *just cause* for *separating* from the communion of a Church. Thus I have insisted on the *recessions* of our present Presbyterian brethren from the sentiments of our Reformers about the *public worship* of the Church, and some of its appendages. Perchance I have done it too tediously; if so, I shall endeavour to dispatch what remains more curtly.

III. They have also deserted our Reformers in the *discipline* of the Church. The particulars are too numerous to be insisted on. Let any man compare the two "Books of Discipline," the "First," compiled by our Reformers, anno 1560—the "Second," by the Presbyterians of the *first edition*, and *ratified* by Act of the General Assembly holden in April, 1581, and he shall find no scarcity of differences; he shall find alterations, innovations, oppositions, contradictions, &c. Let him compare the Acts of Assemblies after

[1] [Melville was the chief instrument in compiling and drawing up the Second Book of Discipline.—E.]

[2] P. 15.

[3] [This was the Convention which met immediately after the murder of Charles I., Lord Chancellor Loudon presiding.—E.]

the year 1580, with the Acts of Assemblies before, and he shall find many more. Indeed, our present Presbyterians have made not a few notorious recessions from the "Second" —the *Presbyterian Book* of Discipline. To instance in a few.

The third chapter of the "Second Book of Discipline" is thus entituled—"How the persons that bear ecclesiastical function are admitted to their offices." This chapter treats of such persons in the general. The particular orders of pastors, doctors, elders, &c. are particularly treated of in subsequent chapters. This third chapter, treating thus of ecclesiastical officers in the general, makes two things necessary to the *outward call*, *election*, and *ordination*, Section 6. It defines ordination to be "the separation and sanctifying of the person appointed by God and his Church, after that he is well tried, and found qualified." It enumerates "fasting, prayer, and imposition of hands of the eldership," as the *ceremonies* of *ordination*, Section 11, 12. Now, the whole nation knows no such things as either trial, fasting, or imposition of hands, are used by our present Presbyterians in the *ordination* of *ruling elders*.

The sixth chapter is particularly concerning *ruling elders*, as contra-distinct from *pastors* or *teaching elders*. And it determines thus concerning them, Section 3—"Elders, once lawfully called to the office, and having gifts of God fit to exercise the same, may not leave it again." Yet nothing more ordinary with our present Presbyterians than laying aside ruling elders, and reducing them to a state of *laicks*; so that, sure I am, if ever they were *presbyters*, they come under Tertullian's censure (De Præscrip.)—"*Hodie Presbyter, qui cras laicus*"—"*A Presbyter to-day, and a porter to-morrow!*"

By the ninth section of that same chapter—"It pertains to them (these ruling elders) to assist the pastor in examining those that come to the Lord's Table, and in visiting the sick." This Canon is not much in use,[1] I think, as to the last part of it. As to the first, it is entirely in desuetude.

[1] [It is only fair to observe that, in the present day, at least in the large towns, this canon *is* followed out, and the elders are of great assistance to the parish minister in executing both of the duties here specified, more especially the latter.—E.]

Indeed, some of them would be wondrously qualified for such an office!

The seventh chapter is about *Elderships* and *Assemblies*. By Section 2—"Assemblies are of four sorts, viz. either of a particular congregation, or of a province, or a whole nation, or all Christian nations." Now, of all these indefinitely it is affirmed, Section 5—"In all Assemblies a Moderator should be chosen by common consent of the whole brethren convened;" yet no such thing observed in our kirk-sessions, which are the *congregational* assemblies spoken of, Section 2. But *Mas John* takes the *chair* without *election*, and would not be a little *grated* if the best *laird* in the parish should be his competitor. Crawford[1] himself, the first Earl of the kingdom, had never the honour to be *Moderator* in the *kirk-session* of Ceres!

The fourteenth canon in the same seventh chapter is this—"When we speak of elders of particular congregations, we mean not that every particular parish church can or may have their particular elderships, especially to landward, but we think three or four, more or fewer, particular churches may have a common eldership to them all, to judge their ecclesiastical causes." And Chapter 12, canon 5—As to elders, there should be in every congregation, one or more appointed for censuring of manners, but not an assembly of elders, except in towns and famous places where men of judgment and ability may be had; and these to have a common eldership placed amongst them, to treat of all things that concern the congregations of whom they have the oversight." But as the world goes now, every parish, even in the country, must have its own *eldership*, and this eldership must consist of such a number of the *sincerer sort*, as may be able to outvote all the *Malignant* heritors upon occasion, as when a minister is to be chosen, &c. So long as there is a *precise ploughman*, or a *well-affected webster*,[2] or a *Covenanted cobbler*, or so, to be found in the parish, such a number must not be wanting. The standing of the *sect*

[1] [William sixteenth Earl of Crawford, a zealous Presbyterian, and the instigator of much severity to the Episcopal incumbents, after the Revolution. His mansion of Struthers, long the seat of the Crawford Family, is situated in the parish of Ceres, near Cupar-Fife. The title is now dormant, and the estates are possessed by the Earl of Glasgow.—E.]

[2] [Weaver.—E.]

is the *supreme law*—the *good cause* must not *suffer*, though all the *canons* of the *Kirk* should be put to *shift* for themselves.

IV. The last thing I named, as that wherein our present Presbyterians have forsaken the principles and sentiments of our Reformers, was the *government of the Church*; but I have treated so fully of this already, that it is needless to pursue it any farther. I shall only, therefore, as an appendage to this, represent one very considerable *right* of the Church, adhered to by our Reformers, but disclaimed by our present Presbyterians. It is her being the *first* of the three Estates of Parliament, and having vote in that great council of the nation.

It is evident, from the most ancient records, and all the authentic monuments of the nation, that the Church made still the *first* of the three Estates in Scottish Parliaments, since there were Parliaments in Scotland. This had obtained time out of mind, and was looked upon as *fundamental*, in the constitution of Parliaments, in the days of the Reformation. Our Reformers never so much as once dreamed that this was a *Popish corruption*. What *sophistry* can make it *such?* They dreamed as little of its being unseemly, or scandalous, or incongruous, or inconvenient, or whatever, now-a-days, men are pleased to call it. On the contrary, they were clear for its continuance as a very important right of the Church. The "First Book of Discipline," Head 8, allowed clergymen "to assist the Parliament when the same is called." It is true, Calderwood both corrupts the *text* here, and gives it a false *gloss*. Instead of these words—"*when the same is called*," he puts these—"*if he be called*";[1] and his *gloss* is—"meaning with advice (says he), not by voice, or sitting as a member of that Court." I say this is a false *gloss*. Indeed, it runs quite counter to all the principles and practices of these times; for not only did the *Ecclesiastical Estate* sit actually in the Reforming Parliament, anno 1560, and all Parliaments thereafter, for very many years, but such *stress*, in these times, was laid on this *Estate*, that it was generally thought that nothing of public concern could be legally done without

[1] Spottiswoode, 168; Calderwood, 28.

it. The counsel of the Ecclesiastical Peers was judged necessary in all matters of *national* importance. Thus, anno 1567, when the *match* was on foot between the Queen and Bothwell, that it might seem to be concluded with the greater authority, pains were taken to get the consent of the principal Nobility by their subscriptions. But this was not all. That all might be made as sure as could be, "all the Bishops who were in the city were also convocated, and their subscriptions required," as Buchanan tells us.[1] And, anno 1568, when the accusation was intented against the Queen of Scotland before the Queen of England's arbitrators, that it might be done with the greater appearance of the consent of the nation—that it might have the greater semblance of a national deed, as being a matter wherein all Estates were concerned, the Bishop of Orkney and the Abbot of Dunfermline[2] were appointed to represent the *Spiritual Estate*.[3] Again, anno 1571, when the two counter Parliaments were holden at Edinburgh, those of the Queen's faction, as *few* as they were, had the *votes* of *two* Bishops in their Session, holden July 12, as is clear from Buchanan and Spottiswoode compared together.[4] In their next Session, which was holden at Edinburgh, August 22, that same year, though they were in all but *five* members, yet *two* of them were Bishops, as Spottiswoode tells.[5] But Buchanan's account is more considerable,[6] for, he says, one of these two was there unwillingly; so that it seems he was forced by the rest to be there, out of a sense they had of the *necessity* of the Ecclesiastical Estate. Now, it is to be remembered that those who appeared for the Queen were *Protestants*, as well as these who were for her *son*.

No man, I think, will deny but the subsistence of the *Ecclesiastical Estate*, and their vote in Parliament was confirmed and continued by the Agreement of Leith, anno 1572. Indeed, when the project for Parity amongst the officers of the

[1] Postridie, quod in urbe fuit Episcoporum convocatur in aulam, ut et ipsi quidem, subscriberent. Buchanan, 667.

[2] [Robert Pitcairn, of whom Buchanan says that he was "homo non minoris consilii quam fidei.—E.]

[3] Buchanan, 698; Spottiswoode, 219.

[4] Buchanan, 756; Spottiswoode, 254.

[5] Spottiswoode, 256.

[6] Buchanan, 760.

Church was set on foot by Melville, anno 1575, and some of the clergy were gained to his side, and they were using their utmost endeavours to have Episcopacy overturned, it seems this was a main difficulty to them—a difficulty which did very much entangle and retard their purpose; this, I say, that the *overturning Prelacy* was the overturning one of the *three Estates* of Parliament. This is evident not only from Boyd, Archbishop of Glasgow—his discourse to the General Assembly, anno 1576, mentioned before, but also from the two letters I have often named, which were written to Mr Beza, the one by the Lord Glammis, anno 1576 or 1577, the other by Mr Melville, anno 1579. Because they contribute so much light to the matter in hand, I shall once more resume them. Glammis was then Chancellor of Scotland. It is manifest he wrote not indeliberately, or without advice. Undoubtedly he stated the question according to the *sense* the *generality of the people* had then of it; now he states it thus—"Seeing every church hath its own pastor, and the power of pastors in the Church of Christ seems to be equal, the question is—Whether the office of Bishops be necessary in the Church for convocating these pastors when there is need for ordaining pastors, and for deposing them for just causes? Or—Whether it be better that the pastors, acting in parity, and subject to no superior Bishop, should choose qualified men for the ministry with consent of the patron and the people, and censure, and depose, &c.? For retaining Bishops we have these two motives, one is—the stubbornness and ungovernableness of the people, which cannot possibly be kept within bounds,[1] if they are not overawed by the authority of these Bishops in their visitations. The other is, that such is the constitution of the Monarchy,[2] which hath obtained time out of mind, that as often as the Parliament meets for consulting about things pertaining to the safety of the republic, nothing can be determined without the Bishops, who make the *Third Estate* of the kingdom, which, to change or subvert, would be extremely perilous to the kingdom." So he: from which we may learn two things —the *first* is a farther confirmation of what I have before

[1] Qui vix ac ne vix quidem in officio contineri potest.

[2] Leges regni longo usu et inveterata consuetudine receptæ.

asserted to have been the sentiment of these times concerning the *election of pastors*, namely, that it was that they should be *elected by the clergy*, and that *the people* should have no other *power* than that of *consenting*—the *other* is *pat* in relation to our present business, namely, that the *Ecclesiastical Estate* was judged *necessary* by the *constitution* of the *Monarchy*—it could not be wanting in Parliaments—it was to run the hazard of subverting the *constitution* to think of *altering* it, or *turning* it out of doors. And Melville's letter is clearly to the same purpose—"We have not ceased these five years to fight against pseudo-Episcopacy, many of the Nobility resisting us, and to press the severity of discipline; we have presented unto his royal Majesty and three Estates of the Realm, both before and now in this Parliament, the form of discipline to be insert amongst the Acts, and to be confirmed by public authority. We have the King's mind bended towards us"—(too far said, I am sure, if we may take that King's own word for it)—"but many of the Peers against us. For they allege, if pseudo-Episcopacy be taken away, one of the Estates is pulled down; if Presbyteries be erected, the royal Majesty is *diminished*," &c. It is true, Melville himself here shows no great kindness for the *Third Estate*, but that is no great matter; it was his *humour* to be *singular*. All I am concerned for is the public sentiment of the nation, especially the Nobility, which we have so plain for the *necessity* of the Ecclesiastical Estate, that nothing can be plainer. Nay, so indisputable was it then, that this Ecclesiastical Estate was *absolutely* necessary by the *constitution*, that the Presbyterians themselves never called it in question—never offered to advance such a *paradox* as that it might be abolished. After they had abolished Episcopacy by their Assembly, 1580, the King sent several times to them, telling them—"He could not want *one* of his *Three Estates*. How would they provide him with an *Ecclesiastical Estate*, now that they had abolished Bishops?" Whoso pleases to read Calderwood himself shall find this point frequently insisted on. What returns gave they? Did they ever in the least offer to return, that the having an *Ecclesiastical Estate* in Parliament was a *Popish corruption*—that it was an *unwarrantable* constitution—that it was *not necessary*—or that the constitution might be entire enough without it?

No such thing entered their thoughts. On the contrary, they were still clear for maintaining it—they had no inclination to part with such a valuable right of the Church. Their answer to the King's demands was still *one* and the *same*—"They were not against Churchmen having vote in Parliament, but none ought to vote in name of the Church without commission from the Church." And this their sentiment they put in the very "Second Book of Discipline," for these are, word for word, the seventeenth and eighteenth Articles of the eleventh chapter.—"We deny not, in the mean time, that ministers MAY and SHOULD assist their Princes when they are required, in all things agreeable to the Word of God, whether it be in Council or Parliament, or out of Council; providing always they neither neglect their own charges, nor through flattery of Princes, hurt the public estate of the Kirk."—"But generally we say that no pastor, under whatsoever title, of the Kirk, and specially the abused titles in Popery of Prelates, Chapters, and Convents, ought to attempt any thing in the Church's name, either in Parliament or out of Council, without the commission of the Reformed Kirk within this Realm."[1] And it was concluded in the Assembly holden at Dundee, March 7, 1598—"That it was NECESSARY and EXPEDIENT, for the well of the Kirk, that the ministry, as the third Estate of this Realm, in name of the Church have vote in Parliament."[2] So indubitable was it in these times that the *Ecclesiastical Estate* was necessary, and that it could not be wanting without the notorious *subversion* of the *constitution* of Parliaments. Indeed, it was not only the sentiment of General Assemblies, whatever side, whether the *Prelatical* or the *Presbyterian* prevailed; but it was likewise the sentiment of *all Parliaments*. It were easy to amass a great many Acts of a great many Parliaments to this purpose. I shall only instance in a few.

Thus, the eighth Act, Parliament[3] 1, Jac. VI., holden in December 1567, appoints the *Coronation Oath* to be *sworn* by the King. And it is one of the articles of that Oath—

[1] Spottiswoode, 299; Calderwood, 112.

[2] MS. Petrie, 545; Spottiswoode, 449; Calderwood, 420.

[3] [Acta Parl. Scot. vol. iii. p. 23, 24.—E.]

"That he shall rule the people committed to his charge according to the loveable laws and constitutions received in this Realm, nowise repugnant to the Word of the eternal God." Now, I think, this Parliament made no question but that "the fundamental law" of the "constitution of Parliaments" was one of these "loveable laws and constitutions" received in this realm, nowise repugnant to the Word of the eternal God. Indeed, the 24th Act of that same Parliament[1] is this, word for word—"Our Sovereign Lord, with advice and consent of his Regent and the Three Estates of Parliament, has ratified and ratifies all civil privileges granted and given by our Sovereign Lord's predecessors to the Spiritual Estate of this Realm, in all points, after the form and tenor thereof:"—than which there cannot be a more *authentic* commentary for finding the true sense and meaning of the *Coronation Oath* in relation to our present purpose. I shall only adduce two more, but they are such two as are as good as two thousand.

The 130th Act,[2] Parliament 8th, Jac. VI., anno 1584, is this, word for word—"The King's Majesty, considering the honour and the authority of his Supreme Court of Parliament, continued past all memory of man unto these days as constitute upon the free votes of the three Estates of this ancient kingdom, by whom the same, under God, has ever been upholden, rebellious and traitorous subjects punished, the good and faithful preserved and maintained, and the laws and acts of Parliament, by which all men are governed, made and established; and finding the power, dignity, and authority of the said Court of Parliament of late years called in some doubt, at least some"—such as Mr Andrew Melville, &c.—"curiously travelling to have introduced some innovations thereanent; his Majesty's firm will and mind always being, as it is yet, that the honour, authority, and dignity of his said three Estates shall stand and continue in their own integrity, according to the ancient and loveable custom bygone, without any alteration or diminution: THEREFORE it is statuted and ordained by our Sovereign Lord, and his said three Estates in this present Parliament, that none of his lieges and subjects presume, or take upon

[1] [Act 33, in Acta Parl. Scot. vol. iii. p. 32, 33.—E.]

[2] [Act 3, in Acta Parl. Scot. vol. iii. p. 393.—E.]

hand, to impugn the dignity and the authority of the said three Estates, or to seek or procure the innovation or diminution of the power and authority of the same three Estates, or any of them, in time coming, under the pain of treason." Here, I think, the necessity of the three Estates, whereof the *Ecclesiastical* was ever reckoned the *first*, is asserted pretty fairly. Neither is this Act, so far as I know, formally repealed by any subsequent Act; and whosoever knows any thing of the history of these times cannot but know that it was to crush the designs set on foot then by some, for innovating about the *Spiritual Estate*, that this *Act* was formed. The other which I promised is, Act 2, Parliament 18,[1] Jac. VI., holden anno 1606, intituled—"Act anent the Restitution of the Estate of Bishops," in the preamble of which Act we are told—"That of late, during his Majesty's young years and unsettled estate, the ancient and FUNDAMENTAL policy, consisting in the maintenance of the THREE ESTATES of Parliament, has been greatly impaired, and almost subverted, specially by the indirect abolishing of the Estate of Bishops, by the Act of Annexation of the temporality of benefices to the Crown—that the said Estate of Bishops is a necessary Estate of the Parliament," &c.

Such were the sentiments of these times—so essential was the *Ecclesiastical Estate* deemed in the *constitution* of *Scottish* Parliaments. And no wonder, for no man can doubt but it was as early, as positively, as incontestedly, as fundamentally and unalterably, in the constitution, as either the Estate of *Nobles* or the Estate of *Boroughs*. There is no question, I think, about the Boroughs. As for the Estate of *Nobles*, it is certain all *Barons* were still reckoned of the *Noblesse*—the *lesser Barons* in ancient times were still reckoned a part of the *second*—never a *distinct Estate*—of Parliament; and they must quit all pretensions to be of the *Noblesse* when they set up for a distinct Estate. Setting up for such, they are no more of the *Nobility* than the *Boroughs*; and then, if *two* Estates can *vote out one*, and make a Parliament without it—if they can split one into *two*, and so make up the *three* Estates, why may not one split itself as well

[1 Acta Parl. Scot. vol. iv. p. 281-284.—E.]

into *three*? Why may not the *two* parts of the splitted Estate join together, and *vote out* the Estate of *Boroughs?* Why may not the *Nobility* of the *first magnitude* join with the *Boroughs* to *vote out* the *smaller Barons?* Why may not the *smaller Barons* and the *Boroughs vote out* the *greater Nobility?* After *two* have *voted out one*, why may not *one*—the more numerous—*vote out* the *other*—the less numerous? When the Parliament is reduced to *one* Estate, why may not that *one* divide, and *one-half* vote out the *other*, and then *subdivide*, and *vote out*, till the whole Parliament shall consist of the Commissioner for *Rutherglen*,[1] or the *Laird* of ,[2] or the *Earl* of *Crawford?* Nay, why may not that *one vote out* himself, and leave the King without a Parliament? What a dangerous thing is it to shake foundations? How doth it unhinge all things? How plainly doth it pave the way for that which our brethren pretend to abhor so much, viz. a despotic power, an absolute and unlimited monarchy? But enough of this.

To conclude this point, there is nothing more notorious than that the *Spiritual Estate* was still judged *fundamental* in the *constitution* of Parliaments—was still *called* to Parliaments—did still *sit*, *deliberate*, and *vote* in Parliaments, till the year 1640, that it was turned out by the then Presbyterians; and our present Presbyterians, following their footsteps, have not only freely parted with, but forwardly rejected, that ancient and valuable *right* of the Church. Nay, they have not only rejected it, but they declaim constantly against it as a *limb of antichrist*, and what not. And have they not herein manifestly deserted the undoubted principles and sentiments of our Reformers?

It had been easy to have enumerated a great many more of their notorious recessions from the principles of the Reformation. e. g. I might have insisted on their deserting the principles and practices of our Reformers about the constitution of General Assemblies—about communion with the Church of England—about the civil magistrate's power in Church matters (justly or unjustly is not the present question) —and many more things of considerable importance. Nay,

[1] [John Scott, a noted partisan in his day, was member in the famous Convention of Estates which established the Claim of Right.—E.]

[2] [This blank is in the original edition.—E.]

which at first sight may seem a little strange, as much as they may seem to have swallowed down the principles of rebellion and armed resistances against lawful sovereign princes, maintained by our Reformers, yet even herein there is difference—considerable difference.

Our Reformers, as much as they were inclined to rebel against kings, did yet maintain that they held their crowns *immediately* of God. John Knox, in his sermon preached on the 19th of August 1565, and afterwards published, hath this plain position—"That it is neither birth, influence of stars, ELECTION OF PEOPLE, force of arms, nor, finally, whatsoever can be comprehended under the power of nature, that maketh the distinction between the superior power and the inferior, or that doth establish the royal throne of kings; but it is the only and perfect ordinance of God, who willeth his terror, power, and majesty, in a part, to shine in the thrones of kings and in the faces of judges," &c. Neither was this only his private sentiment. The twenty-fourth Article of the "Confession of Faith," compiled by our Reformers, and ratified by Act of Parliament, is every whit as plain and decretory; for there they "profess to believe that empires, kingdoms, dominions, and cities, are distincted and ordained by God—that the powers and authorities therein are God's holy ordinance—that persons placed in authority are to be loved, honoured, feared, and holden in most reverend estimation, because they are God's lieutenants, in whose session God sits as judge, to whom by God is given the sword, &c.—that, therefore, whosoever deny unto kings their aid, counsel, or comfort, while they vigilantly travel in the executing of their office, they deny their help, support, and counsel to God, who, by the presence of his lieutenant, craveth it of them." So it was professed by our Reformers. How this principle could consist with their practices is none of my present concerns—that is no more than to show how our Presbyterian brethren have deserted them in this matter. Now, our Presbyterian brethren make kings, as such, not *God's*, but the *people's* creatures; by consequence, not *God's*, but the *people's* lieutenants—the *people* sets them on their thrones—they have their *power* from the *people*—they are the *people's trustees*—they are accountable to the *people*.

So that "whosoever denies his aid, counsel, or comfort to them, while they vigilantly travel in executing their office," in true logic can be said to deny them *only* to the *people!* Even here, then, there is this great difference—our Reformers maintained *one good principle* in relation to sovereign powers —our present Presbyterians have even rejected that *one* good principle. It is true, indeed, our Reformers seem to have been inconsequential in substituting rebellious practices in the retinue of an orthodox principle; and our Presbyterian brethren seem to be consequential in having their principle and their practice of a piece. But doth this mend the matter? Nothing, as I take it; for all ends here—that our Reformers believed *right*, though they practised *wrong*; but our Presbyterian brethren are altogether *wrong*—they neither believe nor practise *right*. Thus, I say, it had been no difficult task to have instanced in many more of our *Presbyterian* innovations. But the taste I have given, I think, is sufficient for my purpose. For, laying together so many *undeniable* innovations—so many palpable and notorious recessions from the principles and practices of our Reformers, as I have adduced, and these in so weighty and important matters as the *doctrine*, *worship*, *discipline*, *government*, an *rights* of the *Church*, I may fairly leave it to the world to judge if our brethren have just reason to insist so much upon the principles of our Reformation, or to entitle themselves, as on all occasions they are so solicitous and forward to do, the only *real* and *genuine successors* of our Reformers.

Neither is this all that may justly pinch them. They have not only receded from our *Scottish* Reformers, but from all other *Reformed Churches*. What *Reformed Church* in *Christendom* maintains all the articles of the "Westminster Confession?" What *Reformed Church* requires the profession of so many articles, not *mainly* for *peace* and *unity*, but as a *test* of *orthodoxy?* What *Reformed Church* except our *Kirk* maintains the *Divine institution* of *Parity* among the pastors of the Church, so as to make all kind of *Prelacy* simply *unlawful?* What *Reformed Church*, except the *Scottish*, wants a *Liturgy?* What party in Europe, that assumes the name of a National Church, condemns *Liturgies*, set forms of Prayer, &c. as *unlawful*, except *Scottish Presbyterians?* What *transmarine Reformed Church*, that is not

Lutheran, condemns the communion of the Church of England? What *Reformed Church* maintains the *Divine institution* and the *indispensible necessity* of *ruling elders* in contradistinction to *pastors?* What *Reformed Church* maintains the *Divine institution* and the *unalienable right* of *popular* elections of *pastors?* What *Reformed Church* ever offered to maintain that the *government* of the *Church* by *Bishops*, or a public Liturgy, or want of ruling elders distinct from pastors, or *choosing* pastors otherwise than by the *voices* of the *people*, or *using* some *innocent* and *unforbidden* ceremonies, as circumstances or appendages of Divine worship, or *observing* some *days* besides *Sundays*, were sufficient grounds for *breaking* the *peace* of a Church, and *dividing* her *unity*, and setting up *altar* against *altar?* What *Reformed Church* was ever *bound*, by her *Rules* and *Canons*, to require of all such as she admitted to the participation of the Lord's Supper, the *subscription* of such *terms* as are contained in the *Solemn League and Covenant?* What *Reformed Church* doth not satisfy herself with the profession of the Faith contained in the Apostles' Creed at Baptism? What *Reformed Church* requires the profession of such a vast, such a numberless, number of articles and propositions as are contained in the "Westminster Confession" and the "Larger and Shorter Catechisms," of all those whom they *receive* into the Catholic Church? What is this less, than to make all these propositions *necessary terms* of their Communion? And how impossible is it, at this rate, ever to think of a *Catholic* Communion among Christians? Is not this needlessly, and, by consequence, very *criminally* and *unchristianly*, to lay a *fund* for unavoidable, unextinguishable, and everlasting schisms? Neither, yet, is this all the misery; for, considering the *measures* our brethren *steer* by, there is little ground to *hope* that they shall ever turn *weary* of innovating. The first *brood* of Presbyterians—the old *Melvillians*, inverted (as I have told) almost the whole *scheme* of our Reformers. The next *birth*—the *thirty-eight-men*, made innumerable recessions from their *progenitors* the *Melvillians*; the present *production* have forsaken *most* of the *measures* of the *thirty-eight-men*, and what hopes of their *fixing?* When shall it be proper for them to say—We have done *innovating?* Hitherto we

have *innovated*, but we will *innovate* no farther. How dreadful a thing is it for men to give loose reins to the *spirit of innovation!* But I shall not pursue this farther. I know the temper of our brethren. It is but too too probable they may impute it to *malice*, *revenge*, or an *imbittered spirit*, to some *ill* thing or another, that I have pursued this matter so far; but if they shall, I pray God forgive them, for they are injurious to me. The principle which prompted me to represent these things was truly that of *fraternal correption*. My main design was to *soften*, not *irritate* them—not to *exasperate* them, but to bring them to a more *manageable* and *considering temper*. For I can, and do, sincerely protest, that it is daily the earnest desire of my soul *that all men may be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth*. I wish all men *Christians*, and I wish all *Christians*, *Christians indeed*. In a special manner I wish our Presbyterian brethren and we may yet be so much honoured and blessed of God, that in the sincerity of brotherly kindess we may be all united in one holy Communion. I wish we may all earnestly contend, with all Christian forbearance, fellow-feeling, and charity, as becometh the members of the *one Church*, whereof Christ Jesus is the Head, to have the *poor*, *divided*, *desolated Church of Scotland*, restored to that peace, purity, and unity—that order, government, and stability, which our blessed Master hath instituted and commanded. May Almighty God inspire us all with the Spirit of his Son, that our hearts being purified by an humble and a lively faith—the faith that worketh by love, and our lives reformed according to the laws and great purposes of our holy religion, we may be all unanimously and dutifully disposed, for so great, so glorious, so desirable a mercy! And with this I end this Fifth Inquiry.

And now, I think, I have competently answered the end of my undertaking, which was to examine this Article of our new "Claim of Right," and try its firmness and solidity. I think I have comprised, in these Five Inquiries, every thing that is material in it, considered either in itself, or as it supports the great alterations which have been lately made in the Church of Scotland. It might have been more narrowly sifted; and, sifted more narrowly, it

might have been found liable to many more exceptions. For instance,

1. It may seem somewhat surprising that such an Article should have been put into a *Scottish* "Claim of Right"—that it should have been made so *seemingly fundamental*, at least in the constitution of the Scottish Monarchy, which is so famous, and has been so much renowned for its antiquity. Was ever such an Article in a *Scottish* Claim of Right before? No man, I think, will say it was in the *original contract* made with Fergus I. (if any original contract was made with him), for if he was, he was advanced to the throne three hundred and thirty years before our *Saviour's birth*, if we may believe our historians; and, I think, it was not an article in the original contract then, that the Christian Church should be so or so governed. Few men, I think, will say it was part of the original contract made with any Scottish King before the Reformation. No man can produce any such article in any original contract made with King James VI., King Charles I., or King Charles II., unless it was the "Solemn League and Covenant," or the "Act of the West Kirk."[1] It cannot be said that it was

[1] [This famous document was drawn up for the special benefit of King Charles II. after his first return from abroad, to assume what has been well styled "a kind of mock royalty among the Covenanters of Scotland;" and as it fairly illustrates the principles of the Covenanters, and their ideas of obedience to the powers that be, it will not be uninteresting to our readers to have it subjoined. It is dated "West Kirk, 13th August 1650," and proceeds thus—"The Commission of the General Assemblie, considering there may be just ground of stumbling from the King's Majestie refusing to subscribe and emitt the Declaration offerd to him by the Commission of Estates, and the Commission of the General Assemblie, concerning his former carriage and resolutions for the future, in reference to the cause of God and the enimies and frinds therof, doeth therfor declaire that this Kirke and kingdome doe not awen nor espousse any Malignant parties, quarrell, or intrest, but that they fight meirly upon their former grounds and principalls, and in defence of the causse of God and of the kingdome, as they have done thesse twelve yeires bygaine; and *therfor as they disclaim all the sin and the gilte of the King and of his housse, so they will not awen him or his intrest nowayes then with a subordination to God, and suafare as he aimes and prosecuttes the causse of God, and disclaimes his and his father's opposition to the causse of God, and to the Covenant, and lykwayes all the enimies therof;* and that they will, with convenient speed, take in consideratione the papers lately sent unto them from Cromwell, and vindicat themselves from all the falshoods conteined therin, especially in these things quherin

in any *original contract* made with King James VII.; for all the nation knows it was declared by the Meeting of Estates, that he *forfeited his right to the crown* for having made no *original contracts*. These are all the real or pretended Kings we have had since the Reformation till the late Revolution. Is not this Article, therefore, a *new fundamental* added to the constitution of the ancient Scottish monarchy? This is all upon the supposition that it is truly a *part* of our new *Claim of Right*.

2. Though, indeed, it may be made a question, whether it can be justly called a *part* of the "Claim of Right?" It is very possible for *one* thing to be *in* another, without being *part* of that *other;* and, one would think, this Article looked very unlike a *part of* a Claim of Right. It seems not to run in the *style* that is *proper* for *Claims of Right*. It is certain, it runs not in the *style* of the *rest* of the *Articles*. All the rest of the Articles tell us either what is *contrary to law*, or what are the undoubted *rights* of the *people*. This Article imports nothing like either the *one* or the *other*—it only *declares* Prelacy to be a *grievance*, &c. This doth not say that it was *contrary* to law, for *laws* themselves may *be*, and actually *were*, declared to be *grievances* by the Meeting of Estates in another paper; and the Articles declaring that Prelacy ought to be *abolished*. is an argument that it *subsisted* by *law*, and it was abolished as subsisting by law, for the Act which abolished it *repealed* the *laws* by which it *subsisted*. Neither is Prelacy declared by the *Article* to be *contrary* to the *rights*, but only to the *inclinations*, of the *people;* and, I think, it requires no *depth* of *metaphysical precision* to distinguish between *rights* and *inclinations*. Indeed, it seems obvious to any body that this Article had had its *situation* more properly and *naturally* amongst the *grievances* which

the quarrell betwix us and that partie is misstaited, as if we awned the late King's proceedinges, and were resolued to prossecute and mainteine his present Majestie's intrest before and without acknowledgment of the sine of his housse and former wayes, and satisfaction to God's people in both kingdomes." It has been remarked by Skinner, in his Ecclesiastical History, vol. ii. p. 420, that "in this artful paper we have an authentic explication of their (the Covenanters') former views and future purposes, and from the whole strain of it, may easily see what their sentiments were of the late King's fate, and how indifferently they stood affected to the young prince whom they had amongst them."—E.]

were digested in another paper; and, therefore, I say, being only *preternaturally*, and by apparent *force*, thrust into the "Claim of Right," it may be made a question, whether its being *so* there, be enough to make it *part* of the "Claim of Right;" or whether its *nature* should not be regarded rather than its *post*. And it should be constructed to have no more weight than if it had been *regularly* ranked in its own *category?* But such questions are too hard for me, and more proper for lawyers to determine.

3. Neither shall I meddle with many other obvious difficulties, which must necessarily result from this Article being made truly a part of the *original contract* between King and people, such as its making the settlement of the Crown to depend, not on right of inheritance, or proximity of blood, or any such ancient, legal, solid, hereditary title, but on the every day *changeable inclinations* of the *people*; for these are the main *fund* of the Article, and, by the supposition, the Article is *intrinsical* and *fundamental* to the present settlement. This, I say, and many more such, which might be easily named, seems a very considerable difficulty that might be urged on such a supposition; but I shall not insist on them,

4. Farther, besides all these *awkward* exceptions, whether it is or is not a *part* of the "Claim of Right," the *style* of it might deserve to be considered, particularly that phrase of "Prelacy being a great and insupportable grievance and trouble to the nation." It is true, I have in my Third Inquiry *guessed* at its meaning, but I do sincerely acknowledge it was but *guessing*; and even yet I can do no more but *guess* about it. Doth it not at first sight appear a little too *big* and *swelling?* Is it not hard to find for it a certain and determined *sound?* To call a thing a "great and insupportable grievance and trouble," seems a little too *flashy* and *fanciful*. Is it not liker to the *flights* of the rhetoricians designed for *popular amusement*, than to the plain, solid, significant stile which is proper for the grand council of a nation — for *original-contract* and *claim-of-right-makers?*

5. Seeing it is plain the Article was formed for the abolition of Prelacy, and the introduction of Presbytery, it seems a little strange that such an important revolution in the Church should have been founded on such *untheological*

reasons. It seems to lie at the bottom of this Article, that the *government* of the Church is *ambulatory* and *indifferent*—that there is nothing of *Divine institution* about it—that the State may alter it when it pleases; and, as it thinks expedient, set up alternatively either Prelacy or Parity, or neither, but plain Erastianism, if it has a mind for it. These are suppositions which, I think, ought not to be very relishing even to our Presbyterian brethren. Though hitherto they only have got advantage by the Article, yet it seems not *honourable* for their government to stand on such a foot, nor can they be secure but that it may be very soon turned down again.

6. Though, in consequence of this, by G[ilbert] R[ule]'s measures the *framers* of the Article were *incapable* of *voting* about the establishment of any *form* of government in the Church; for they proceeded in *voting* this Article clearly upon the *principles* of *indifferency*.[1] But, according to him, as I have already observed, such, though they may be persons both religious and learned, are not to be brought into the *reckoning* with those who have *right* to *vote* about Church-government. Indeed, according to his scheme, the nation by this Article is brought to a very lamentable state; for thus an Article is *imposed* on it by such as had no *right*—no *power*—to *impose* it, because they have fairly declared themselves to be for the *indifferency* of particular *forms* of Church-government. And yet, by another proposition in his scheme, this Article cannot be *altered*; for this is one of his positions, that the *deed* of a *Meeting* of *Estates* is to be interpreted the *deed* of the *whole nation*. From which it follows, by unavoidable consequence, that the *whole nation* hereafter must be *excluded* from *voting* about the government of the Church; for the *whole nation* (even Presbyterians themselves not excepted), by establishing this Article have declared themselves *indifferent* as to the *species* of Church-government. Now, as I said, is not this a lamentable state to which the nation is reduced? It lies under the burden of an ill-contrived Article, imposed by such as were not *competent*—had no *right* to *impose* it; and yet it must lie *remedilessly* under this *burden*, because those who *imposed* it, by *imposing* it while they were not competent

[1] Second Vindication, ad Letter III. Section 4.

nor *qualified* for *imposing* it, have rendered the *whole* nation *incompetent* and *unqualified* for *altering* it, or freeing itself from such a *burden*. Was ever nation so miserably intricated? But enough of G[ilbert] R[ule].

These, I say, and several other things, might have been farther considered and insisted on, but having already answered the ends of my undertaking, I shall proceed no farther. I conclude with this:—If these papers shall have the fortune to come to the hand of any *Scottish* Noblemen or gentlemen, and if they shall think it worth their while to peruse them, I earnestly beg one piece of justice from them. It is, that they would not apprehend I had the least intention or inclination to cast *disgrace* on such of them as concurred either to the *framing* or the *voting* of this Article. I love my native country—I honour all persons of *true* honour in it—I have no where *impugned* the *authority* of those who established this Article. I had no such purpose—my undertaking required no such performance. All I designed was to do service to my country according to my poor abilities. I cannot think any ingenuous person—any person of true honour—can deny that it is good service done to mankind to tell them truth *civilly*, and endeavour *dutifully* to recover them from mistakes, if they labour under any. We are all fallible, and capable of taking things by the wrong handle; and a very *mean* person may be sometimes a seasonable *monitor*. If I have said any thing *false* or *amiss*, I crave all men pardon; but if I have advanced nothing but *truth*—if I have done nothing but *justice* to this Article—(and I protest seriously I think I have done no more)—I cannot think it will be *just* or *generous* in any man to harbour *picques* against me for doing what I have done. The *genuine* use (I am sure it is *genuine*) I wish my countrymen, of whatever station or character, may make of my examination of this Article, is, to suffer themselves to be put to thinking by it, and inquiring whether there may not be some other Articles, every whit of as great importance to the nation, in our new "Claim of Right" as ill founded as this; and if any such are found, to contribute their joint endeavours, as becometh *true Scottish men* and *good Christians*, to have all righted.

THE AUTHOR'S TABLE OF CONTENTS.

PAGE

[The Preface, - - - - - - - 1]

The Article, - - - - - - - 97

The Examination, comprized in Five Inquiries, - - 97, 98

First Inquiry—Whether the Church of Scotland was reformed solely by Presbyters, - - - - - 98

Prelates concurred to our Reformation, - - - 99

Our Reformation mostly performed by Laicks, - 99, 100, 101

Second Inquiry—Whether our Reformers were Presbyterians, 102

The Importance of this Inquiry, - - - - ib.

Four Presumptions that our Reformers were not for the Divine Right of Parity, - - - - - 102-123

Presumption I.—No such controversy agitated in the Protestant Churches, while ours was a Reforming - - - 102

Presumption II.—Our Reformers as little employed about such Controversies as any Reformers, - - - - 105

Presumption III.—None of our Reformers can be proven to have been for the Divine Right of Parity, &c. - - - 106

Some, indeed, did not value Holy Orders, - - - 107

They declaimed generally against Popish Bishops, - - 108

But as much against Presbyters, - - - - 109

The Earl of Moray no Presbyterian, - - - 111, 112

Nor John Knox largely, - - - - - 113-121

Presumption IV.—Our Reformation cherished principally, under God, by *English* Influences, - - - 123

Scotland naturally disposed to be influenced from England, - 124

How free of Foreign Influences in the time of the Reformation, 125

How much King Henry VIII. of England earnest to have an interest in Scottish affairs, - - - - - - 126

Particularly to promote a Reformation in Scotland, - - 133

How zealous the Papists were of this, - - - - 140

King Edward pursued the same design, - - - 142

English Influences in Queen Mary's time, - - 143

More vigorous in Queen Elizabeth's time, - - - 144

Our chief Reformers enlightened in England, - - 145

None of them enlightened elsewhere, - - - - 146

Our Reformers in communion with the Church of England, - 147

Even Knox, - - - - - - - - 150

The English allowed of our Communion, - - - 153

Both Churches then of one Constitution, - - - 154

Evident from Public Deeds, Treatises, &c. - - 154, 155, 156

From the Scottish Public Prayers, - - - 160

Such an Unity of Religion then between the two Nations, that our modern Presbyterians cannot be the Successors of our Reformers, 163

English Liturgy used for seven years in *Scotland*, - 164-167

Our Reformers allowed the same power to the Civil Magistrate in Religious Matters which the English Reformers did, - 168

Our Reformers agreed with the English Reformers in the *Rule* of Reformation, - - - - - - 169, 170

PAGE
A Recapitulation representing the Force of these Presumptions, 170, 171
Direct Proofs that our Reformers were for *Imparity*, - - 172
And their *Petitions* for Reformation clearly for *Imparity*, - 173
They established a Government which subsisted by *Imparity* among Pastors, - - - - - - - - 180
The Pre-eminencies of *Superintendents* enumerated, - 181-194
The Presbyterian Pleas dispatched, - - - 195
Plea I.—That *Superintendency* was designed only to be temporary, largely discussed, - - - - - - - ib.
Gilbert Rule's strange Divinity considered, - - 205, 206
Plea II.—That *Superintendents* were not Bishops, largely discussed, 206
Plea III.—That *Superintendency* was never established by Act of Parliament (being Gilbert Rule's Plea) discussed, - 211
An Historical Introduction to the Settlement of Episcopacy, anno 1572, - - - - - - - - 213-224
The Ancient Method of preparing Matters for *Scottish* Parliaments, 225
The Settlement of Episcopacy, anno 1572, - - 225, 226
The Presbyterian Pleas against that Settlement, - - 227
Plea I.—Taken from the Incompetency of the Authority of the Assembly at *Leith*, discussed, - - - 227-232
Plea II.—That the Clergy were under force from the Court, largely discussed, - - - - - - - 232-241
Plea III.—The limitedness of the Episcopacy then settled, discussed, 241
Plea IV.—That that *Episcopacy* was never approven by the Church, largely discussed, - - - - - 242, 243
Bishops then Constant Moderators, - - - 243
That Settlement approved by several Assemblies, - 243, 244
Largely pursued, and Gilbert Rule corrected, - - 245-254
The Rise and Progress of *Presbyterianism* in Scotland, - 254
Mr Andrew Melville, - - - - - ib.
John Durie, - - - - - - 256
Episcopacy first quarrelled, August 6, 1575, - - 257
The *Parity-Men* at that time defeated, - - - 258
Petrie exposed, - - - - - 259
Parity-Men defeated also at the next Assembly, holden in April 1576, 262
Probable that Morton and Queen Elizabeth were in the Plot for introducing Presbytery into Scotland, - - 264-271
"Second Book of Discipline," when first projected, - - 271
The Prelatists very much ignorant then of true Ecclesiastical Antiquity, &c. - - - - - - - 272
Evident from the instance of Adamson, - - - 273
From their not challenging the unlearned Positions in the "Second Book of Discipline," - - - - - 274
Nor the unlearned Positions in Beza's Book—"De Triplici Episcopatu," - - - - - - - 275
Presbyterianism weak in the Assembly holden in October 1576, 279
Made no direct Progress in the Assembly holden in April 1577, 281
Nor in the next Assembly, October 1577, - - - 282
Got two advantages this year, - - - - 282, 283
Morton directed the Regency, - - - - ib.
Beza's Book brought to Scotland, - - - - 283

PAGE
Made considerable Progress in the Assembly, April 24, 1578, 284
More Progress in June 1578, - - - - 285
More yet in October 1578, - - - - 286
More in July 1579, - - - - - - 288
Presbyteries first heard of in this Assembly, - - - ib.
Gilbert Rule's impudent Ignorance exposed in the *Rise* of Presbyteries, - - - - - - - - 291
The "Second Book of Discipline" not sworn in the "Negative Confession," - - - - - 292, 293
Episcopacy condemned in July 1580, - - - 294
The Act of the Assembly condemning it, - - - ib.
A Recapitulation of what hath been said on the Second Inquiry, 296, 297
A *Demonstration* that *Presbyterians* are not the *Successors* of our Reformers, - - - - - 297, 298
THIRD INQUIRY—WHETHER PRELACY, &c. WAS A GREAT AND UNSUPPORTABLE GRIEVANCE, &c. EVER SINCE THE REFORMATION, - 298
Demonstrated that it was not, - - - - 299
By Reason, - - - - - - ib.
By Testimonies, - - - - - - ib.
It was no such GRIEVANCE for the fifteen years after Reformation, 300
Nor for forty after these Fifteen, - - - 301
No, not to Presbyterians themselves, anno 1637, and downwards, 303
A Challenge to the Presbyterians to produce any Evidence that PRELACY was such a GRIEVANCE ever since the Reformation, 306
Gilbert Rule's shameless Ignorance in his Attempt discovered, 306, 307
His ignorant Impudence again discovered, - - 307-311
FOURTH INQUIRY—WHETHER PRELACY WAS SUCH A GRIEVANCE, &c. WHEN THE ARTICLE WAS FORMED, - : - 311, 312
Probably the Rabbling Work the Fund of the Assertion in the Article, - - - - - - - 312
The Author of "Plain Dealing's" Arguments about the Inclinations of the People discussed, - - - - - 315
The Author of the "Ten Questions"—his Arguments vindicated against Gilbert Rule, - - - - 316-319
The "Farther Vindicator's" Arguments examined, - 319-321
The Arguments insisted on by the Author of the "Third Letter" vindicated against Gilbert Rule, - - - 321-326
Gilbert Rule's ridiculous Limitations of the *Inclinations* of the People, 326
The Article represented with these Limitations, - - 329
Gilbert Rule's Argument for his side of the Question considered, ib.
Some Questions proposed for the clearer Demonstration of this Controversy, - - - - - 330-333
FIFTH INQUIRY—WHETHER THE PREMISES IN THE ARTICLE, IF TRUE, WOULD BE COMPETENT FOR INFERRING THE CONCLUSION, - 333
Not the *First*, viz.—the "Inclinations of the People," - ib.
Not the *Second*, viz.—that "this Church was Reformed by Presbyters," - - - - - - - - ib.
These Reasons probably chosen rather for their Popularity than their Solidity, - - - - - - 338
Especially the latter, to make the Prelatists odious for deserting our Reformers, - - - - - ib.

PAGE
Owned that in some Things they have deserted them, 339, 340, 341
A *Specimen* of the Principles espoused by our Reformers and rejected by the Episcopal Clergy, 341
Particularly Knox, ib.
A Specimen of his Evangelical Prayers, 342
He was a Providentialist, 343
A Short Apology for our deserting our Reformers in these principles, 346
The Presbyterians have more deserted them, ib.
I.—In Matters of Faith, 348
II.—In Matters of Worship, ib.
Our Reformers for, Presbyterians against, Liturgies, ib.
More particularly our modern Presbyterians have deserted our Reformers, 350, 351
In the *Prayers* of the Church, 352
In the *Lord's Prayer*, 353, 354
In the *Creed* in the ordinary Worship, 355
In the Reading of the *Scriptures*, ib.
In the Office of *Public Praise*, 357
In the decent *Circumstances* of these Offices, 360
In the Administration of *Baptism*, 362
In the Administration of the Eucharist, 362, 363
How our Modern Presbyterians celebrate the Eucharist, 365-372
The Schismatical Conditions they are bound to require of Communicants, 372, 373
A Surprising Schismatical Measure taken by the "Presbytery of Edinburgh," anno 1648 and 1649, 373-376
In the Celebration of *Marriage*, 377
In the *Burial of the Dead*, 378
In the Matter of *Ordinations*, 379
In the Way of *Electing Pastors*, 379-385
III.—In the Discipline of the Church, 385
Instances wherein they have deserted their own "Book of Discipline," 385-387
IV.—In the Government of the Church, 397
A Recapitulation of the Presbyterian Recession, ib.
They have receded in many Things from all other Reformed Churches, 397, 398
The Author's Design in insisting so much on these other Recessions from our Reformers, 399
A Wish for Peace, ib.
The Article liable to many Expressions, 400
Some Instances, 400-403
The Conclusion, 404

END OF

"THE FUNDAMENTAL CHARTER OF PRESBYTERY EXAMINED."

Princeton Theological Seminary Libraries
1 1012 01196 3156

SPOTTISWOODE SOCIETY INSTITUTED AT EDINBURGH
9TH JUNE 1843